

The University of Chicago
Libraries



ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE
TO THE ROMANS

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE
TO THE ROMANS
TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

BY

VERY REV. PATRICK CANON BOYLAN,
M.A., D.D., D.LITT.

*Professor of Sacred Scripture and Oriental Languages, St. Patrick's
College, Maynooth, and Professor of Eastern Languages,
University College, Dublin.*

AUTHOR OF "THE PSALMS"

Dublin

M. H. GILL AND SON, LTD.,

50 UPPER O'CONNELL STREET

1934

BS 3666

.B83

Nihil Obstat:

PATRICIUS DARGAN,

Censor Theol. Deput.

Imprimi potest:

† EDUARDUS,

Archiep. Dublinen.,

Hiberniæ Primas.

DUBLINI, die 26^o Septembris, 1934.



Printed and Bound in Ireland at the Press of the Publishers.

Proc. Theol

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

PAGE

1. DATE	vii
2. PLACE OF COMPOSITION	viii
3. OCCASION	ix
4. PURPOSE	ix
5. THE CHURCH AT ROME	xiii
6. AUTHENTICITY OF THE EPISTLE	xviii
7. INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE	xviii
8. SUMMARY OF THE EPISTLE	xxiii
9. THE TEXT	xxxi

BIBLIOGRAPHY	xxxiii
------------------------	--------

ABBREVIATIONS	xxxvii
-------------------------	--------

COMMENTARY	1
----------------------	---

TRANSLATION	265
-----------------------	-----

PREFACE

This work is intended primarily for students of Theology, but it is hoped that it will be useful to all who are interested in the teaching of St. Paul.

In the Commentary no attempt has been made to supply materials for a history of the exegesis of the Epistle to the Romans. The chief purpose of the Commentary is to set forth as clearly as possible the thought of St. Paul.

Exactitude rather than elegance has been aimed at in the Translation. In making the Translation the Author has sought help from every available version of the Epistle. He wishes to acknowledge his special indebtedness in this matter to the *Westminster Version*.

To the Rev. Professor Kissane and the Rev. Professor Duff, his colleagues in Maynooth, and to the Very Rev. Dr. McQuaid, C.S.Sp., President, Blackrock College, who read the MS. of the Commentary and helped with valuable criticisms and suggestions, the Author's cordial thanks are due. He is also greatly indebted to the Rev. Dr. MacCarthy and other students of the Dunboyne House, Maynooth, and to the Rev. M. B. Langford, M.A., for their kindness in correcting the proofs of the Translation and Commentary.

INTRODUCTION

1. DATE.

When St. Paul had spent a considerable time at Ephesus on his Third Missionary Tour he "resolved in the Spirit to go to Jerusalem, traversing Macedonia and Achaia on the way, and he said: 'After I have been there I must see Rome' (Acts xix. 21)." This journey to Jerusalem, following on a visit to Macedonia and Achaia, and to be followed by a visit to Rome, is obviously the journey to Jerusalem which Paul is about to undertake as he writes the Letter to the Romans:

"At the moment I am setting out for Jerusalem in the service of the Saints.

"For Macedonia and Achaia have decided to make a collection for the poor who are among the Saints at Jerusalem"

(Rom. xv. 25-26).

The work of evangelising the East has been completed: there "is no place left (Rom. xv. 23) in these districts" (*i.e.*, the East) where Christ is still unknown. From Jerusalem to Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19) Paul has fully carried out the preaching of the Gospel in the Eastern world, and now he is determined, when he has handed over in Jerusalem the monies contributed by the Gentile Churches to the poor of the Mother Church, to seek a new field of preaching in the far off West where he will not have "to build upon another's foundation" (Rom. xv. 20).

The Collection which the Apostle is about to take to Jerusalem is clearly that to which he refers in 1 Cor. xvi. 1-4:

"About the Collection for the Saints—do ye just as I ordered the Churches of Galatia to do. On the first of every week each one of you is to set aside and store up whatever he gains, so that collections may not have to be made when I arrive. When I come I will send such persons as you authorise with commendatory letters to Jerusalem. And if it seems worth while that I should go, they can go with me."

Later in the same year in which he wrote these words Paul wrote again to the Corinthians urging them to complete the good work of collecting which they had begun. To help them in successfully accomplishing that task he sends them his friend and companion Titus (2 Cor. viii. 9).

There can be no doubt that the situation implied in Rom. xv is the same as that which Acts and the Epistles to the Corinthians assign to the period immediately following Paul's stay in Ephesus on the Third Missionary Tour. Paul has traversed

Macedonia and Achaia and he is about to set out for Jerusalem with offerings of the Gentile Churches large enough to justify his conveying them personally to the heads of the Mother Church. According to Acts xx. 2-3, Paul spent three months in Achaia on this occasion. These three months were apparently the months December, January and February—the months in which travelling by sea was suspended. Some time, then, during these three months the Letter to the Romans was written—probably either in January or February. At the Pentecost following Paul was arrested in Jerusalem, so that the Letter to the Romans was, in all probability, written in the first or second month of the year in which Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea began—viz., 58 A.D. The Letter to the Romans was thus the last Letter that Paul was to write before his imprisonment. It was written at the close of a long period of brilliant success in evangelising, when Paul was at the height of his powers, and when he was looking forward eagerly to a new missionary enterprise in the extreme West. The Epistle to the Romans belongs then to the same period (the "Ephesian period") as the two Letters to the Corinthians, and is probably comparatively close in date to "Galatians."

2. PLACE OF COMPOSITION

The three months of Paul's stay in Achaia (Acts. xx. 2-3) were probably spent mainly at Corinth, the capital, and in Corinth, according to tradition, the Letter to the Romans was written.¹

The Corinthian origin of the Epistle is made likely by the commendation of Phœbe (xv. 1), the Deaconess of Cenchreæ, for Cenchreæ was a port of Corinth. The greetings from Gaius (xvi. 23)—whom Paul calls his host and the host of the whole Church, point also to Corinth; for Gaius was one of the few whom Paul had baptised at Corinth when he was founding the Corinthian Church (1 Cor. i. 14). It is not unlikely that the Epistle to the Romans was composed wholly, or in part, in the house of Gaius. Erastus, "the city-treasurer" who also sends greetings (xvi. 23), seems to have been, like Gaius, one of the notabilities of the Church at Corinth. In 2 Tim. iv. 20 we hear of an Erastus being left behind at Corinth on Paul's last journey,² and this Erastus may be identical with the "city-treasurer" of Rom. xvi. 23. With the composition

¹ Michaelis seeks to show in an article in ZNW (25, 1926) that the Letter was written at Philippi.

² It is not known whether the Erastus who went as companion of Timothy from Ephesus to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22) is the same individual.

in Achaia (and, therefore, probably in Corinth) of "Romans" agrees the circumstance that Timothy and Sosipater join in sending greetings (xvi. 21), for we know from Acts xx. 4 that Timothy and Sopater (= Sosipater) left Achaia along with Paul when he set out with the Collections for Jerusalem.

Most of the old Marcionite Prologues make Corinth the place of origin of "Romans"—a few only—perhaps by reason of the Marcionite suppression of Rom. xv-xvi—assigning its composition to Athens.

3. OCCASION.

Paul has been eager for a long time to visit Rome (i. 10-15), but his duty of making Christ known everywhere in the East has hitherto made it impossible for him to pay his long planned visit in the West. That obstacle is now removed, and Paul is determined to preach the Gospel in Spain, and to spend some time in Rome on his way thither (i. 15; xv. 24, 28). He hopes to enjoy, for a while, the pleasure of social intercourse with the Roman Christians (xv. 24). He hopes also to impart to them some spiritual gift, and to be strengthened in his own faith and works by the example of their faith and piety (i. 11-12). It is to make his coming visit both pleasant and spiritually profitable that he writes to the Romans. Phoebe's departure for Rome (xvi. 1) supplied the Apostle with a convenient and reliable means of sending the Letter to the Church at Rome.

4. PURPOSE.

If Paul had wished merely to tell the Romans that he intended soon to visit them on his way to Spain he could have done this in a short Letter. Many theories have been put forward to explain the great length and the wide theological range of "Romans."

(a) Augustine (and Ambrosiaster) thought that the Epistle was written to put an end to disputes between Jewish and Gentile Christians, and to reconcile the Gentile Christian majority with the Jewish Christian minority. This view of Augustine has been accepted by many critics of all periods. It seems, however, to have little or no support in the text of the Epistle itself.

(b) It has been held that "Romans" was written to furnish the Christians at Rome with a summary of Pauline teaching so as to make the Apostle's visit to Rome more fruitful.

The absence in the Epistle of all express teaching on

such vital points as the Lord's Supper, the Resurrection, the Divinity of Christ, the Church, etc., excludes this view. The Epistle implies the possession by the Romans of the full tradition of Christian doctrine even in regard to abstruse points.¹ There is no hint that Pauline doctrine involves anything that the Romans do not understand and believe: the Epistle everywhere assumes that the Romans have accurate knowledge on all the great points of Christian teaching.²

- (c) The Epistle was written to counteract Jewish or Judaizing propaganda at Rome.

But against this view stands the absence from the Epistle of the detailed treatment of Christological problems which such a purpose would surely require.

- (d) It was written to counteract a tendency of Gentile Christians at Rome towards contempt for Judaism (so Feine).

But it might as readily be argued—as indeed it has been by many critics (so Aberle, Weber, etc.)—that the Epistle was written to curb the excessive arrogance of Jewish Christians at Rome towards their brethren—the Gentile Christians.

- (e) It was intended to serve as a conciliatory statement of the Pauline Gospel for the Jewish Christians (a minority), who felt their position threatened by the steady growth of Gentile Christianity (so Pfeiderer, Lipsius, etc.).

But it has been stoutly held by other critics (especially Zahn) that the Roman Church addressed by Paul was predominantly Jewish, and that the purpose of "Romans" is to set forth the doctrine of justification by faith so as to move a self-confident Jewish majority to give a sympathetic hearing to the claims of Gentile Christians.

- (f) It was directed against Jewish agitators. A peculiar form of this theory sees in St. Peter the chief opponent against whom the Letter is directed (so Lietzmann).³

It is, however, difficult to find even the slenderest support for this view either in the Epistle or in tradition. The absence of all direct reference to St. Peter furnishes no basis for any theory as to the purpose of the Epistle.

¹ Cf. vi. 3.

² Cf. vi. 17.

³ Lietzmann, *Zwei Notizen zu Paulus* (Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philos. histor. Klasse. 1930. Pp. 153-156). Cf. also Ed. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, III, 434.

It may be said in general that the Apostle's purpose in writing such a profoundly doctrinal Letter, instead of a simple intimation of his intention to visit Rome, can scarcely be expressed in any single formula.

It may be assumed that Paul had considerable knowledge of the condition of the Church in Rome. His friends Aquila and Prisca must have told him much about Rome when he first met them in Corinth (Acts xviii. 2 f.), and since it is probable that Aquila and Prisca maintained their establishment in Rome during their absence at Corinth and Ephesus (Acts xviii. 18, 26 ; 1 Cor. xv. 19), they must have been able to keep Paul well informed on Roman affairs up to the time when they parted with him at Ephesus. It is well known that there was a great deal of travelling between Rome and the Provinces of the Empire during the New Testament period, and information about the general condition of the Church in Rome would have been accessible to Paul in all the great Eastern centres. The existence of a considerable Jewish Colony in Rome, and the close connection of Rome with the Palestinian coast towns, resulting from trade, would also have contributed to make knowledge of Roman Christian affairs available for Paul. His long-standing eagerness to visit Rome would lead him to seek out all possible sources of exact information on the Church at Rome.

Yet, in spite of his knowledge of conditions at Rome, Paul nowhere suggests in the Epistle that there were serious abuses or grave differences of opinion among the Christians at Rome. He praises much more often than he blames, and his attitude throughout is rather that of a thinker dealing with a doctrinal question of general interest, than that of a worried pastor chiding existing defects, or warning against immediate concrete dangers. Neither does it seem to the unprejudiced reader that Paul puts forward in the Epistle any plan or policy for reconciling interests alleged to be seriously opposed, or for curbing ambitions alleged to be immoderate or disruptive.

Paul evidently does wish to secure a friendly reception at Rome ; and he feels that he is entitled to it as the Apostle of the Gentiles, but his long doctrinal Letter is not written so much to secure a friendly reception, as to set forth with fulness and convincing clearness the results of his meditation and preaching on the great central problem of the Church in the decades 40-60 A.D.—the relations of Christianity and Judaism, of the Church and the Synagogue. That problem had been fundamental for Paul since the time when he and Barnabas taught together at Antioch. The

problem was solved in principle at the Council of Jerusalem—but it continued for nearly a decade afterwards to disturb many of the Pauline Churches.

How difficult the situation might become through the machinations of the Judaisers in a particular Church can be seen from the Epistle to the Galatians. It is generally held that that Epistle was written during the early portion of Paul's mission at Ephesus during the Third Missionary Tour, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Apostle was actively occupied, both in meditation and preaching, with the central problems of the Galatian controversy during the greater part of his long stay at Ephesus. "Galatians" would thus belong to the beginnings of the Ephesian Mission and "Romans" would practically mark its close. In the three years of work at Ephesus Paul would pass gradually from the vehemence of expression and rapid movement of thought demanded by the threat of immediate Galatian defection to such comparative serenity of discussion as we find in "Romans." This mental process may well have occupied the greater part of Paul's energies during the Ephesian ministry.

As in the Letters written during the First Imprisonment at Rome, Paul is primarily engrossed with the problem of the precise relations of the Church to Christ, and as in the Pastorals Paul is mainly concerned with the purity of doctrinal tradition, so in the Ephesian period his mind was occupied chiefly with the relations of the Church and the Synagogue. The Letters to the Corinthians which fall within this period reveal comparatively little of Paul's doctrinal preoccupations, because they deal with definite concrete questions and situations which had been referred to Paul, or forced on his attention. Yet even in the Epistles to Corinth many aspects of the great problem dealt with in "Romans" are discussed.

Perhaps in the habit, which Paul shares with the Prophet Isaias, of concentrating for fairly long periods on a particular question, may be sought the explanation of the long discussion of the relations between Judaism and Christianity in "Romans."

There is, of course, no difficulty in admitting that other factors contributed, in a lesser degree, to transform a simple Letter of self-introduction into a great doctrinal synthesis, so that some of the theories above discussed (*a-f*) may contain at least a half truth. In any case, the Epistle to the Romans is not a merely abstract doctrinal discussion. The question of the relations between Judaism and Christianity was sure to be of vital interest to the Christians at Rome, and the Epistle supplies a mass of apologetic material

which they might, at any time, be able to apply in a very practical fashion. But Paul in his Letter is thinking certainly less of the actual conditions of the Roman Church than of problems which might at a later time arise. Hence the brief warning in xvi. 17-20 deals with possible, rather than with existing, difficulties.

5. THE CHURCH AT ROME.

The Epistle to the Romans seems to be addressed to a Church in which the majority of the faithful are converts from heathenism. Many passages in the Epistle can hardly be explained except on this hypothesis.

It is as Apostle of the Gentiles that Paul writes to the Romans (i. 5, 6). It is, apparently, because the Church at Rome has been recruited from the Gentiles that he desires to have some fruit there "even as among the other Gentiles" (i. 13). He longs to visit the Romans because "to Greeks and Barbarians" he "owes a duty." In xi. 13 f. we have:

"But to you Gentiles, I say: Just because I am an Apostle to the Gentiles

I do all honour to my office with a view to rousing to jealousy my own people, and thus saving some of them."

Thus it would appear that his chief interest in Rome is based rather on his office of Apostle to the Gentiles, than on his knowledge of Roman conditions and affairs.

Passages such as vi. 17-21 and xii. 1 f. seem definitely to imply that those addressed had lived in heathenism prior to their baptism. In other passages (*cf.* ix. 3 f.; x. 1 f.; xi. 23-28, 31) Paul is clearly writing to non-Jews about his own people. Paul's reference in xv. 18 to what Christ has wrought through him "unto the submission of the Gentiles" would surely be out of place in a Letter addressed to Jewish Christians. The same must be said of his request to the Romans in xv. 30 f.:

"I exhort you Brethren
by Our Lord Jesus Christ,
and by the love of the Spirit,
to unite in struggle with me
by your prayers to God on my behalf
that I may be rescued
from the unbelievers in Judæa."

The long treatment of Jewish incredulity in ix-xi is a necessary section of an argument which aims at proving that the Gospel is "a power of God unto salvation to everyone that believes, the Jew

first and then the Gentile" (i. 16). If the Jews as a people were to remain permanently impervious to the Faith, it might seem as if the Gospel were as much restricted to non-Jews, as the Law had been to Jews. Jewish incredulity is so treated in ix-xi that it may serve as an instruction and a warning to Gentile Christians. Throughout the section Paul speaks of the Jews as "my brethren," "my fellow-countrymen according to the flesh"—not as "our brethren," "our fellow-countrymen." To show that all the Jews have not been rejected, he points in xi. 1 to himself. If he were writing to a Church that was mainly Jewish, he could have made a much stronger point by referring to the case of his readers.

The passages quoted by Zahn and others to prove that converts from Judaism formed the majority in the Church at Rome do not, when closely analysed, seem to support that view.

The introduction of Jewish opponents in the course of the argument (*cf.* ch. ii, etc.) is due primarily to the Apostle's use of the vivid methods of the Stoic Diatribe. The use of expressions like "Abraham our father" (iv. 1) is due also to the methods of the Diatribe. Ch. iii. 9 is to be explained in similar fashion.

There is no difficulty in regarding vii. i: "For I speak to such as know the Law," as addressed to Gentile Christians. Paul might well presume that the Roman community contained many one-time Proselytes to Judaism. He could also assume that the Roman Christian Community generally had acquired a good knowledge of the Law from hearing it read at the Christian liturgical assemblies. It might be also argued that, as Paul was aware that the Septuagint was widely circulated in the Mediterranean world, he would be justified in taking for granted a wide knowledge of Jewish history and Jewish hopes among the more cultured Gentile Christians at Rome.

It is to be noted also that the whole tone of the argument in vii. 1-6 bears a striking resemblance to that of Gal. iv. 1-9, and "Galatians" was certainly addressed to Gentile Christians.

Moreover, as has often been pointed out, the Romans, as such, had a special flair for law, and they would be greatly interested in the problem of Israel's actual relation to the Mosaic Law. Thus it might be argued that "those who know the Law" of vii. 1, are more likely to be Romans converted from heathenism than Jewish Christians.

Passages like vii. 4-6 and viii. 15 are no more indicative of Jewish readers than Gal. iii. 13; iv. 9.

Zahn takes the appeal for loyalty to the State in ch. xiii as

implying that Paul's readers were of the restless and insubordinate type which was regarded in the Roman Empire as characteristically Jewish. It is, however, not obvious why the warnings in ch. xiii should be less in place for Gentile than for Jewish Christians.

The "weak" at Rome (ch. xiv) are clearly a minority, and if they are, as many think, converts from Judaism, the argument for the predominantly Gentile character of the Roman Community is thereby strengthened.

It is interesting to note in connection with this problem of the character of the Church at Rome in 58 A.D. that the Gospel of St. Mark, which, according to tradition, was written primarily for the Christians at Rome, was evidently intended for non-Jewish readers.

That the Church at Rome in the decade 50-60 contained more converts from heathenism than from Judaism is made probable not merely by the evidence of "Romans," but also by all that we know, independently of "Romans," about the early history of that Church. Of those who first brought the Faith to Rome we know as little as we do of the pioneers of Christianity at Damascus and Antioch. It was inevitable that some knowledge of the Faith should reach Rome very early. At the first Christian Pentecost there were present "Roman" Jews or Proselytes (Acts ii. 10), so that possibly among the first converts to Christianity at Jerusalem were people of Roman origin who afterwards brought back the Faith with them to Rome. Besides, people were constantly travelling in the New Testament period between Rome and the East, and it is reasonable to suppose that when the Faith began to spread in Jerusalem a small percentage of such travellers would be Christians. The persecution of which St. Stephen was the first important victim (Acts vii-viii), scattered the Christians of Jerusalem—especially the Hellenists—and led to the publication of the Faith in the Mediterranean coast-towns. Through the close connection between these towns and Rome, and through the large Jewish Colony that lived at Rome some considerable knowledge of Christianity must have reached Rome even before the founding of the Church of Antioch.

Early Christian tradition connects the name of St. Peter with the foundation of the Roman Church, and the departure of St. Peter "to another place" (Acts xii. 17) after his miraculous rescue from the hands of Herod Agrippa, has been traditionally explained as a departure for Rome. As the organisation of the Church in Samaria, after the first successful preaching of Philip, had been

undertaken by Peter and John (Acts viii. 14–25), and as Barnabas was commissioned by the Apostolic body to investigate affairs at Antioch, and to organise the Antiochian Church (Acts xi. 22), we might expect that the Head of the Apostles would himself undertake the building up of the Church at the centre of the world as soon as the first definite news of Christian beginnings at Rome had reached Jerusalem. The great energy and the splendid condition of the Church at Rome in 58 seem to demand for their explanation the presence and activity in the infant Church of Rome of an outstanding Apostolic personality like that of St. Peter.

That St. Peter worked as an Apostle and died as a Martyr at Rome is fully established by very early and most reliable evidence. In his Letter to the Corinthians, written while St. Peter's memory was still fresh at Rome, Clement of Rome implies clearly (ch. v–vi) that Peter worked and died at Rome. The same can be gathered from the Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans (iv. 3), written in the days of Trajan. St. Peter's work in Rome is implied by the greetings which he himself sends (1 Pet. v. 13) from the Church in "Babylon" (= Rome).¹ The testimony of Bishop Dionysius of Corinth (in Eusebius, ii. 25, 7 f.), of Irenæus (*Hæer.* iii. 1, 1 : 3, 3), of the Roman Presbyter Gaius (Eusebius ii. 25), of Tertullian (*De Præscriptione* 36), and of early inscriptions and Liturgical documents is equally clear in favour of St. Peter's presence in Rome. The testimonies to Peter's work in Rome during the first two and a half centuries are thus not merely Roman, but come from all parts of the early Christian world—Greece, Asia Minor, Egypt, Africa, South Gaul. Even the Gospel of St. John (xxi 18 f.) seems to imply that the manner and the place of St. Peter's martyrdom are known to the universal Church before the end of the first century. It is important to note that no Church in the first centuries but Rome claims to possess the tomb of St. Peter.

If, then, St. Paul's eulogy of the Roman Church implies, as it seems to do, the activity of a powerful Apostolic personality in the building up of that Church, it is evident from what has been here said that the personality in question must have been that of St. Peter.²

St. Peter's episcopal rule in Rome from 42 to 67 did not involve his constant presence in the capital. We find him at the Council of Jerusalem in 49 (or 50), and his own First Epistle seems to imply that he carried through a number of missionary tours quite as

¹ Cf. Apoc. xvii. 8, 18 and Oracula Sibyllina, v. 143, 158 f.

² See on the whole question the recent work of Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom.* 2nd. ed. Berlin, 1927. Cf. also an article by Krüger in ZNW. 31, 301–306.

extensive as those of St. Paul. (*cf.* 1 Pet. i. 1). The absence of all reference to St. Peter in "Romans" is readily intelligible if the Epistle was written during one of the great missionary journeys of the Bishop of Rome.

The history of the Church at Rome from its foundation up to 58 is very little known. From Acts xviii. 2 we learn that Aquila and Prisca were compelled to leave Rome, apparently about the year 50, because of an Edict of Claudius expelling all Jews from Rome. Suetonius in his *Vita Claudii* (25) seems to have that Edict in view when he says: *Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit*. Unfortunately, however, he gives no date. Orosius in his *Historia contra Paganos* vii. 6, 15, says: *Anno ejusdem (i.e., of Claudius) nono expulsos per Claudium urbe Judæos Josephus refert, sed me magis Suetonius movet qui ait hoc modo; Claudius Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit*.

The reference of Orosius to Josephus is not borne out by anything in the extant writings of the Jewish Historian, but the ascription of the Edict to the ninth year (49/50) of Claudius may be due to some other authority whom Orosius confuses with Josephus. The date 49/50 would fit in well with St. Paul's first arrival in Corinth, and his meeting with Aquila and Prisca.

It has been generally assumed that Suetonius, in the brief notice quoted from his *Vita Claudii*, has in view disturbances among the Jews at Rome arising out of the growth of Christianity.¹ It is quite legitimate to suppose that Suetonius confused *Christus* and *Chrestus*—for the two words would be very similar in pronunciation. It is not certain that Aquila and Prisca were already Christians before they were forced to leave Rome—but it is likely that they were. If the policy of Claudius led to the departure of a considerable number of Jewish Christians from Rome,² the original Jewish majority in the Church at Rome would tend to disappear, and from 50 to the death of Claudius in 54, recruiting for the Church at Rome would be mainly from among the heathen. With the death of Claudius his Edict seems to have lapsed, but between 54 and 58 the predominance of converts from heathenism in the Roman Church, due to the Claudian anti-Jewish policy, could scarcely disappear, and it is, therefore, quite natural that St. Paul should write to the Roman Christians in the year 58 as if they were mainly converts from among the Gentiles.

¹ See Article by Preuschen, ZNW, 1914, 96 ff.

² Dio Cassius referring (lx. 6, 6) to the Edict of Claudius, says that the difficulty of expelling great numbers of Jews became so acute that Claudius, in the end, revised his Edict so as to make it merely a prohibition of Jewish assemblies.

6. AUTHENTICITY.

The Epistle's own testimony to Pauline authorship was accepted without hesitation in the Ancient Church, and has never been questioned by any except the most radical schools of criticism. The influence of "Romans" has been detected by scholars in the First Epistle of St. Peter, and in the Epistle of James, and echoes of the Doxology (xvi. 25-27) have been sought in the Epistle of Jude. The Letter of Clement to the Corinthians, and the Letters of Ignatius and Polycarp show unmistakable traces of the phrasing and thought of "Romans."¹

Definite quotations from Romans appear in Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autolycum*, iii. 14; cf. Rom. xiii. 7, 8), and in the Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons (Eusebius, *Ch. Hist.*, v, 1, 6; cf. Rom. v. 18). The early heretics, Valentinus, Herakleon, Basilides, etc., etc., made considerable use of the Epistle, and Marcion ascribed its authorship definitely to St. Paul. Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, iii, 16, 3. 9) speaks clearly of the Epistle as written by Paul. The Muratorian Fragment (line 44 and following), Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*, iii, 4, 39), Tertullian (*Adversus Praxeam* xiii), are all witnesses to Pauline authorship.

7. INTEGRITY.

In ancient times, as is shown in the Commentary, pages 256-260, Marcion, while admitting that St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans, refused to regard certain sections of the Epistle as authentic. The existence of the so-called "short recension" (i-xiv; xvi. 25-27) is explained below in the Commentary as the result of a Marcionite mutilation of the primitive text. Marcionite influence also procured the omission of "in Rome" in i. 7 and i. 15, and it appears that Marcion regarded several other passages of "Romans," in addition to chapters xv and xvi, as not Pauline. His methods of excision, however, in regard to these other passages have not greatly affected textual tradition.²

Certain recent critics have held that we can distinguish a considerable section which, though Pauline, was not originally composed by Paul as part of a Letter to the Romans. Thus Lake (*Earlier*

¹ The evidence in this matter is set forth with great fulness and clearness by SH, *Introd.*, pp. 74-85.

² Marcion apparently omitted i. 19-ii. 1; iii. 31-iv. 25; ix. 1-33; x. 5-xi. 32. He also omitted other short passages, and altered a number of texts in "Romans." Marcion's rejection of chapters xv and xvi was imitated by radical critics in Germany at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century.

Epistles of St. Paul) regards the Epistle to the Romans as an expanded form of an Epistle intended for all the Churches which was written by Paul about the time he wrote "Galatians." Others have supposed that Paul himself produced abridged editions of our "Romans" for use in churches outside of Rome, and it has been held that the various "conclusions" indicate the close of such abridgements.

Other radical critics have excluded from "Romans" the entire section beginning with ch. xii. Others, again, have sought here and there throughout "Romans" for the *disjecta membra* of one or more Pauline Epistles not addressed to Rome. More than a century ago the hypothesis was put forward that "Romans" includes fragments of an Epistle to Ephesus, and the delimitation of these "Ephesian" fragments has formed from time to time a sort of amusement of radical critics. Now-a-days the only part of "Romans" regarded by serious critics as addressed to Ephesus is xvi. 1-23.

In support of the view that Rom. xvi. 1-23 was addressed to Ephesus rather than to Rome two chief arguments have been advanced:

- (1) It is unlikely that Paul, who had not yet visited Rome, could have known at Rome all the people whom he greets in ch. xvi. It is much more likely that those greeted belonged to Ephesus where Paul spent about three years on the Third Missionary Tour. Moreover, some, at least, of the persons greeted seem to have definite connections with Ephesus.

Aquila and Prisca had certainly been with Paul at Ephesus (*Cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Acts xviii. 18, 26), and just as their house at Ephesus was an assembly-place for Christians (1 Cor. xvi. 19) so their residence, according to Rom. xvi. 5 is still a meeting-place for a "House-Church." If we suppose that Rom. xvi. 1-23 was addressed to Rome we must suppose that Aquila and Prisca had returned from Ephesus to Rome and had established a "House-Church" at Rome. Yet from 2 Tim. iv. 19, it would appear that Aquila and Prisca were again in Ephesus after Paul had been released from his first Roman imprisonment. It would be much more natural to suppose that they had stayed on at Ephesus. It is difficult to think of them as moving to and fro restlessly between Ephesus and Rome. Further,

Epænetus, "the first-fruits of Asia," is surely more in place in Ephesus, the Capital of Asia, than in Rome! Besides, if it is alleged that Paul had come to know in the East all those whom he greets in ch. xvi, it will be necessary, the critics argue, to postulate that a miniature exodus—a sort of minor *Völkerwanderung*—from East to West had taken place in the interval.

- (2) The warnings in xvi. 17–20 are out of place in a Letter addressed to a Church which St. Paul had not yet visited, whereas, they are precisely such warnings as would be suitable for a Church like Ephesus, where false teaching of the type here warned against certainly flourished when Paul wrote his First Epistle to Timothy.

In reply to (1), it may be pointed out that in the Epistle to Colossæ—a Church which Paul had not founded or visited—more individuals are greeted than in Letters written by Paul to Churches which he had founded. Indeed in Letters addressed to his own Churches St. Paul seems to have shrunk from singling out individuals for special greeting lest the others whom he knew just as intimately might feel aggrieved. On the contrary, when writing to a Church which he had not visited, he would naturally be inclined to seek out and utilise every existing link, or point of contact, between himself and the Church in question. Paul, as has been pointed out above, could have learned from Aquila and Prisca and others a great deal about outstanding personalities and groups in the Church at Rome, and he would not be slow to use the knowledge so gained to secure a friendly reception in Rome. Nor is there any difficulty in supposing that several of Paul's acquaintances had actually moved from the East to Rome. His visits to important Eastern cities must have brought him into contact with many people about to travel to Rome. It should be remembered that Paul had long been planning a visit to Rome, and, in view of this, he would surely make every effort to get into touch with people going to Rome, or in any way connected with Rome.

The destination of ch. xvi cannot be inferred from the mere names of those greeted. Most of the names are such as might be found in any important centre of the Roman Empire at the time of St. Paul. They are all to be found in Roman inscriptions (see Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 3rd ed., pp. 171–175), and no doubt they could all be paralleled from the inscriptions of St. Paul's Ephesus.

To describe Epænetus as "the first-fruits of Asia" is as natural

in a letter to Rome as in one written to Ephesus. A citizen of the Roman Province of Asia might well move from Ephesus to Rome!

Much use has been made of the difficulty of supposing that Aquila and Prisca had moved within a period of about sixteen years from Rome to Corinth, from Corinth to Ephesus, from Ephesus to Rome, and finally from Rome to Ephesus. But Aquila and Prisca may have been wealthy folk. When they left Rome for Corinth on account of the Edict of Claudius they probably left their property in the hands of a procurator, so that when they returned to Rome after the death of Claudius and the practical repeal of his anti-Jewish Edict, they were able at once to resume control of their Roman belongings. When they went to Ephesus with Paul they probably established there a new centre of their business, and their Ephesian home became a meeting-place for Christians. Just as we suppose that they retained their Roman possessions when they first left Rome for Corinth, so it can be readily assumed that their Ephesian establishment continued to be maintained up to the date of the Second Epistle to Timothy. It is likely that the persecution of Nero drove them from Rome to Ephesus.

The Roman destination of ch. xvi does not imply such a *Völkerwanderung* as has been alleged by the supporters of the "Ephesian" theory. Paul does not, in fact, claim to know personally all those whom he greets. Besides Aquila and Prisca he seems to have known personally Epænetus, Andronicus, Junias, Ampliatus, Persis, and probably the mother of Rufus, and Rufus himself. Aquila and Prisca were residents in Rome before Paul knew them, so that the alleged *Völkerwanderung* would consist of seven people! The others whom he greets Paul may have known (like some of those whom he greets in "Colossians") only by hearsay. When Paul first began to plan his visit to Rome he must have used every available opportunity to make himself acquainted with the condition of things at Rome, and to ascertain the names of such Christians at Rome as would be helpful to him on his arrival there. The list in ch. xvi is conceivably in part, at least, the outcome of the Apostle's inquiries.

(2) It is not clear why Paul could not have addressed xvi. 17-20 to a Church he had not visited. It would almost seem as if Paul at verses 17-20 suddenly took the pen from the hand of Tertius, the Scribe, to insert a word of solemn warning. In 1 Cor. xvi. 21 f. in similar abrupt fashion, after greeting the Corinthians, the Apostle bursts forth unexpectedly into an anathema against those who do not love Jesus Christ.

The warning in *vv.* 17–20 is not really out of harmony with the generally eulogistic tone of the Epistle, for the danger at which it hints need not be regarded as actual. A warning against a merely problematical danger could not have been put in a central part of the Epistle. Lagrange thinks that the real answer to the difficulty of *xvi.* 17–20 is to admit, on the one hand, that Judaizing agitators were already, to Paul's knowledge, at work in Rome, and, on the other hand, to insist that their subversive activity was still almost negligible, and certainly not such as to call for mention at a central stage of a Letter so profoundly speculative as "*Romans.*" The warning is really more against possible than actual evils, and to make it more than a sort of post-script would lead to the risk of exaggeration. The comparative vividness with which the agitators are depicted does not necessarily indicate real uneasiness on the part of the Apostle. It should be noted that the agitators are not of the Gnostic type that one might expect to find at Ephesus, but apparently, of the Judaizing type which Paul had met everywhere.

It appears, then, that the reasons advanced for the Ephesian destination of *xvi.* 1–23 cannot be regarded as valid. Moreover, it is practically unthinkable that Paul could have written a Letter consisting almost exclusively of greetings.

If *Rom.* *xvi.* 1–23 were a Letter to Ephesus it would have to be explained how it has come to be attached to "*Romans.*" Various unconvincing explanations of the connection have been put forward. One of these represents Phoebe,¹ the bearer of both the "*Ephesian*" and the Roman Letter, as travelling first to Ephesus where she hands over the "*Ephesian*" Letter to the Ephesian Church, and permits the Ephesians to make a copy of the Letter to Rome. In the Ephesian Collection of Pauline Letters the original Letter to Ephesus and the copy of "*Romans*" came to be closely associated, and ultimately to be regarded as one Letter.

The theory has also been advanced that the two Letters came to be united because they were close together in Paul's own set of copies of the Letters he had written. This view seems to contain the fantastic implication that Paul carried on his "*correspondence*" like a modern business-man. It is now generally held that the first Collections of Pauline Letters were made by individual Churches. The arrangement of the Letters within the local collections had nothing to do with any "*typical*" arrangement in a conjectured set of documents kept by St. Paul himself.

¹ It is interesting to note that when Paul is writing to a community that he does not know, the bearer of the Letter is indicated with special clearness. Cf. *Col.* *iv.* 7; *Ephesians* *vi.* 21–22—in both cases Tychicus.

8. SUMMARY OF THE EPISTLE.

I. *Prologue.* I, 1-15

(1) Address, I, 1-7.

(2) Praise of the Romans and reasons for writing the Letter. I, 8-15.

II. *Theme of the Letter.* I, 16-17

The Gospel is a power of God that leads to salvation for everyone that believes—the Jew first, and then the Gentile ; because in the Gospel is made known the essential condition of eternal life—justification, which is through faith, and is given graciously to those that believe.

III. *Negative proof of Theme.* I, 18-III, 20

(1) The Gentiles have failed to attain justification by the works of the Natural Law, and (2) the Jews have equally failed to attain it by the works of the Mosaic Law.

The failure of the Gentiles is shown by the actual corruption of the heathen world (I, 18-32). Though it was possible for the Gentiles to know God through the works of His hands, they have given Him neither honour nor thanksgiving as God. Thinking themselves wise they have fallen into the deepest folly. They have exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for idols in the forms of birds, and four-footed and creeping things. For this God has abandoned them, by the withdrawal of His graces, to unnatural lusts, so that, instead of God's grace, every kind of depravity abounds among them.

(2) Similarly the Jews have failed to attain to justification through the works of the Mosaic Law. This is obvious from the corrupt condition of the Jewish world, and is borne out by Scripture (II, 1-III, 20).

The Jews have in the Mosaic Law the expression of God's will, and, therefore, a sure "standard of knowledge and truth." Hence they claim to be the guides of the blind, and a light to the Gentiles. Yet, in fact, they disregard the precepts of the Law, and their guilt is greater than that of the Gentiles.

They put a vain trust in the rite of circumcision, forgetting that the true Jew is not he that is outwardly circumcised, but he that has "the circumcision of the heart."

Jewish corruption is established not merely by the easily observed facts of contemporary history, but by the very words of Holy

Scripture itself, which show that all men—and especially therefore the Jews to whom the Scriptures were first addressed—are under sin, and liable to God's judgment.

It is, then, rather the anger of God, than the justice by which He makes men just, that reigns in the Jewish, as well as in the heathen, world. The Mosaic Law therefore does not justify men, but only gives them knowledge of sin.

IV. *Development of Theme.* III, 21–IV, 25

The justification which the Law does not procure, the Gospel shows forth—justification by faith (III, 21–IV, 25).

In contrast with the failure of Gentiles and Jews to attain justification, Paul proceeds to show that in the Gospel there is made known a genuine and effective power of salvation—"the justice of God which is given to all that believe" with living faith in Jesus Christ—a power which is not limited or conditioned by racial or regional factors, but is put graciously within the reach of all—whether Jews or Gentiles—that loyally accept the Gospel message. The propitiatory Sacrifice of Christ on Calvary is the objective basis of that justice; its subjective condition is "the submission of faith."

This Christian way of salvation—justification by faith—is not something hitherto unknown. That justification is by faith, and not by the works of the Law, is the teaching of the Law and the Prophets. It was by faith that Abraham was justified, as is clearly taught in Genesis, and with Abraham circumcision was not a source of justification, but only the seal of a justification already received.

Similarly, also, David makes it clear that justification is not through works, since even the sinner who has no works, but "believes in Him Who justifies the impious," may, through God's gracious mercy, receive justification. Moreover, when David declares him blessed "whose sin the Lord does not reckon," his congratulation refers to the uncircumcised, as well as to the circumcised.

Since it was through faith in the Divine promises, and not through works, that Abraham was justified, those who are to be blessed by the fulfilment of the promises made to Abraham must also be justified by faith. The posterity of Abraham that was to be blessed was not to be his children according to the flesh, as such, but the heirs of his faith. To us, as to Abraham, faith is reckoned unto justice—our faith, that is "in Him who raised up from the dead Jesus, Our Lord, Who was given up to death on account of our offences,

and was raised up on account of our justification." In his unwavering acceptance of the Divine promises of Messianic blessings Abraham accepted implicitly all that Christians believe concerning the Lord. Hence the faith by which Abraham was justified is ultimately the same as that by which we, his children, accept the Gospel.

IV. *The fruits of justification.* V, 1-VI, 23

The first of these is peace with God. Christ is the Author of that peace—since it is by Him that "we have obtained through faith access to this grace in which we stand."

With peace there goes confident hope of salvation. And so confident are the justified of salvation, that they not merely do not lose heart in the trials and difficulties of the Christian life, but actually rejoice in them. For these troubles, when bravely endured, intensify virtue, and virtue, thus strengthened by trial, gives new ground for hope. Instead, therefore, of grieving at their daily troubles, Christians boast of them.

The firm anchorage of Christian hope is guaranteed by the love of God which the Holy Spirit pours out in the hearts of the justified, and by all that is implied in the Death and Resurrection of Christ.

When those who are now justified were sinners and enemies of God, they were reconciled with God by the death of His Son. Surely now, therefore, when by grace they share in the life of His Son, they may most confidently hope that their life of grace—which is *gloria inchoata*—will pass over into the full glory of the children of God.

A further fruit of justification is freedom from the slavery of Sin (VI, 1-25), so that "where Sin abounded, Grace has, all the more, superabounded."

By our union with the death of Christ in baptism we have died utterly to Sin, and in the life of the justified, which is a life lived in union with the Risen Lord, there is no place for Sin. The justified must regard themselves "as dead for Sin, but as living for God in Christ Jesus."

The service of justice has taken the place of the old slave-service to Sin. As the justified, when they were still unregenerate, offered their members as slaves to impurity and lawlessness, so must they now, in the life of the Spirit, offer their members as slaves to Justice. The old slavery of Sin has been replaced by the joyous service of Justice, and for that service we shall receive as a reward (which is also a gracious gift) "Eternal Life in Christ Jesus Our Lord."

V. *Abolition of the Slavery of the Law*

From the standpoint of the problem of the relations between Judaism and Christianity one of the most striking effects of justification is freedom from slavery to the Law. (VII, 1-25).

As Baptism implies dying with Christ, and as death releases from all legal obligations, Christians are altogether freed from the Mosaic Law. Thus the claims of Jewish propaganda are completely set aside. "By dying to that in which we were held captive we have been released from the Law, that we may serve in a new spirit, and not in the old letter."

The Law was in itself holy, and just, and good, but by its challenge to disorderly appetite, and its failure to give help for its own observance, it came to be used by Sin as an instrument and ally. The Law as such was certainly not Sin, for it was the expression of the Divine Will, and therefore something essentially good. But Sin—that its intrinsic malice might be recognised—wrought death for men by means of that which was in itself good. How helpless in the struggle with Sin were those who had nothing but the Law to help them, Paul explains by a vivid description of the conflict between the higher and lower Self, occasioned by the commands of God's positive Law. That conflict brought home to Paul the consciousness of his own wretchedness, and awoke in him an intense longing for rescue from "the body of this death"—a longing which has been at length satisfied by the grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Thus, though the Law was used by Sin as an instrument, it forced Sin to show itself in its true malice, it intensified men's consciousness of sin, and it made them long for justification.

VI. *The Law of the Spirit.* VIII, 1-39

The Mosaic Law has been abolished for Christians, for "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set us free from the law of Sin and death." The justified, therefore, though they are freed from the Mosaic Law, are not free from all law, for they are subject to the law of the Spirit—and must keep their minds fixed on the things of the Spirit.

The Spirit of God dwells in the justified, and they are bound, therefore, to live "according to the Spirit," and not "according to the flesh."

As endowed with the Spirit Christians can fulfil all the commands of the Divine Law. The Spirit they have received is a spirit of sonship, which enables them to realise that God is their Father.

As children of God, then, they are His heirs, and they are co-heirs with Christ—provided that, like Christ, they suffer in order to enter into their glory.

That Christians will share in the glory of Christ is shown by “the anxious longing of all creation eagerly awaiting the manifestation of the Sons of God,” and by our own groaning for the fulness of Sonship which is to be given in the Resurrection. The intercession within us, and with us, of the Holy Spirit is a further pledge of the glory to come, and the Divine call to the Faith, and the justification which has followed it, are an earnest, too, of the glory to which Christians are heirs.

If God has given up His own Son to death for our redemption, how shall He not give us all else with Him? Shall God Who justifies us bring complaint against us? Shall Christ Jesus, Who died for us, and intercedes for us at God’s right hand, condemn us?

Here St. Paul breaks into a sort of chant of victory on the security of the justified. There is no force above or below—neither Death nor Life, nor Angels nor Principalities, nor Present, nor Future, nor Powers, nor Height, nor Depth, nor any other creature—that can sever Christians from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus, Our Lord!

VII. *The problem of Israel’s unbelief.* IX–XI

Lest it might be objected that God’s promises to Israel had failed in view of Jewish unbelief, or that the Gospel was not in fact a power unto the salvation of the Jews, Paul deals at length with the problem of Israel’s rejection of Christ.

The Divine promises have not failed because of Jewish unbelief, because they were made to the spiritual Israel, the “Israel of God,” not to the Israel of carnal descent. In selecting those who are to receive the Messianic blessings God is absolutely free. The history of Israel shows that God’s choice is not determined by the works of those whom He chooses, but is supremely free and gracious. This is evident in the case of Isaac, and still more vividly so in that of Jacob.

As the potter can make from the same mass of clay splendid or common vessels, and the meaner vessels may not chide him because he has not made them beautiful, so when God chooses to display the wealth of His glory through “vessels of mercy which He pre-fashioned for glory,” the great Potter may not be criticised by the “vessels of wrath.”

It is clear, too, from the Old Testament that the Elect of Israel were to be chosen out of a small section of Israel.

The failure of Israel is attributable to Israel itself (X) because it strove after a justice of its own, a justice through works, and so stumbled over the Messias, the Stone of Stumbling. Though the idea of justification by faith is clear in the Old Testament, the Jews quite failed to grasp it.

The Jews cannot pretend that the Gospel has not been published to them—for even to the ends of the earth the Apostolic message has been borne.

This very failure of Israel to believe, and the growth of the Gentile mission were clearly foreshadowed by Moses, Osee, and Isaías.

But it must be remembered that Israel has not wholly failed (XI).

Paul himself, a genuine son of Israel, has been called, and there are many other Israelites also that believe. There is still a loyal "Remnant" in Israel as there was in the Israel of the days of Elias!

Moreover, the failure of the great mass of Israel is not wholly deplorable: through it the Faith has reached the Gentiles more quickly. If, then, "the transgression of the Jews has been the wealth of the world, and their failure the wealth of the Gentiles, how much more will their full conversion" be the wealth of the world?

And that full conversion will take place, for the olive-tree that is Israel has a holy root and stock, and on it the believing Gentiles have been merely grafted. The holy tree will not die, and the branches which it has lost through unbelief will, at some future time, be engrafted on it once more.

Meanwhile the Gentile Christians must not be arrogant, but afraid, for if God has not spared the natural branches of the olive-tree, neither will He spare the engrafted shoots of wild olive! At the close of the discussion Paul announces as a "mystery" that, when all the Gentiles have entered into the Church, all Israel also will be saved. This "mystery," he points out, is shadowed forth in Old Testament Prophecy.

The rejection of Israel, then, is only for a time, and it is unto the profit of the Gentiles. The advantage thus gained by the Gentiles will, in turn, rouse Israel to emulation, and thus, because the Gentiles have received mercy, Israel itself will ultimately find mercy! It is the providence of God "to shut up all in disobedience that He may show mercy to all."

In praise of the Wisdom which reveals Itself in that Providence Paul breaks forth into a Hymn—as at the end of Chapter VIII.

B. Moral Section. XII, 1–XV, 13

In this section the principles expounded in the Dogmatic Section are applied in the concrete, and the Roman Christians, bound together as they are in the brotherhood of Christ, and living under the law of the Spirit, are reminded of their general and special duties.

(a) General Duties

(1) The Christian life is a sacrifice in which the self is offered. To make that offering well-pleasing to God Christians must transform themselves by constant renewal of mind—by submitting themselves more and more perfectly to the guidance of the Spirit (xii. 1–2).

(2) Each individual must use loyally for the good of all the special graces he has received, but charity is to be fostered above all charisms—charity not merely to associates and friends, but to enemies so that evil may be overcome by goodness (xii. 3–21).

(3) To Civil Authority Christians must show obedience and respect, “for there is no power except from God, and those that exist have been established by God.” The officials of the State are to be regarded as God’s ministers, and rebellion against civil authority is rebellion against the ordinance of God. Submission to authority, and the payment of imposts for the maintenance of the State are to be considered as binding in conscience (xiii. 1–7).

(4) All genuine debts must be paid. The greatest is the debt of fraternal charity. This, it is true, can never be discharged in full, but in paying it Christians pay all other debts, for “charity is the fulfilment of the Law” (xiii. 8–10).

(5) The present time is one of serious crisis, and all contact with the works of darkness must be utterly excluded. Christians must arm themselves with the weapons of light, and “put on the Lord Jesus Christ” (xiii. 11–14).

Special Duties

(1) The “strong” (in faith) must deal gently with the weak. Every Christian must be respectful and considerate towards his

brethren : all belong to Christ, and the judgment to be pronounced on each must be left to Christ (xiv. 1-12).

(2) The aim of the faithful should be to help one another, and scrupulously to avoid placing stumbling blocks in the paths of the brethren. No Christian may assert his own freedom, or advertise his independence of outlook at the risk of scandalising a brother, or inducing him to act against his conscience (xiv. 13-23).

(3) It should be the ambition of all to maintain a spirit of good-will and tolerance, and to seek to please others "unto goodness" rather than to please themselves, in imitation of Christ "Who did not please Himself." Thus all will be "of one mind," and will praise "with one mouth God and the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ" (xv. 1-6).

(4) In the mixed Church at Rome both Gentile and Jewish Christians should remember that God is glorified by the Conversion of both Jews and Gentiles, for the conversion of Gentiles proclaims to the world the mercy of God, and the conversion of Jews is a testimony to God's loyalty and truth (xv. 7-13).

Epilogue. XV, 14-XVI, 27

The Epilogue begins with a series of personal messages.

Paul explains again his reasons for writing to the Romans. They do not need instruction from him, and he has written (in a certain degree, it is true, rather daringly) not so much to instruct them, as to recall to their minds what they had already known. He was entitled to write to them as Apostle of the Gentiles. It is, indeed, his function to perform priestly service by means of the Gospel, preparing the Gentiles thereby to be an acceptable offering to the Lord.

As the instrument of Christ he has been greatly successful, for Christ has wrought mightily and wonderfully through him throughout all the great world that lies between Jerusalem and Illyricum. He has finished his work in the East, for there is now no district of importance in the East where Christ has not been made known. He will, therefore, seek a new field of missionary enterprise in the extreme West, and on his way to Spain he will visit the Church at Rome—not to build on another's foundations, but to console himself by contact with Roman faith and piety, and to find new strength from intercourse with the Romans for his preaching in the West. He expects, too, that the Romans will speed him forward to the West when his short visit to Rome has ended.

But he must first travel to Jerusalem to hand over the proceeds of the Collections made by the Churches of Macedonia and Achaia for the "Saints" at Jerusalem.

When he comes to Rome he hopes to come with the fulness of Christ's blessing (*cf.* i. 11-12). He is anxious about the outcome of his visit to Jerusalem, and he begs the help of his readers' prayers that he may be "rescued from the unbelievers in Judæa", and that he may be well received by the "Saints."

If all goes well in Jerusalem, he will come to Rome in joy in God's good time and "refresh" himself with the Romans! May the God of peace be with them all!

The last chapter begins with a recommendation to the readers of Phœbe, a Deaconess of Cenchreæ, the bearer of the Epistle.

There follows a remarkably long list of greetings to Paul's friends and acquaintances at Rome.

Then taking the pen, apparently, from the hand of the scribe, Tertius, Paul inserts a word of solemn warning against false teachers who have either begun to poison Rome with their teachings, or may be expected soon to appear there. The reputation of Roman obedience to the Gospel is so great, and so well-known, that Paul desires that the Roman Christians should remain "wise unto good, but pure in regard to evil" (xvi. 17-20).

With verse 21 Tertius resumes the pen, and greetings are sent from the companions who are with Paul in Corinth (xvi. 21-23).

The Epistle is brought to a close by the Doxology in which some of the most striking thoughts of the Epistle are resumed (xvi. 25-27).

9. THE TEXT.

The Greek New Testaments of Vogels, Nestle, and Merk are so excellent and inexpensive that it has not been thought expedient to print the Greek text of the Epistle to the Romans in the present work.

It has been assumed throughout that readers are familiar with the essential facts in the history of the Greek text of the New Testament. The chapter on textual criticism in the Introduction to Lagrange's *Épître aux Romains* (Introduction, ch. vii), the discussions on points of textual criticism in that Commentary, the remarks in the *Addenda* and *Corrigenda* in the most recent edition of the Commentary (1931), and the critical edition of the Greek text of the Epistle with which the Commentary is prefaced, will be found very helpful. In regard to the history of Textual Criticism and the procedure of textual criticism in the concrete in "Romans" Lietzmann's *An die Römer* (Fourth Edition, 1933) may be consulted

with profit. Lietzmann employs in his work all the material available in 1933 for textual study of "Romans"—including even Thompson's work, *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles*, published in 1932. The third century text of portions of the Epistle to the Romans contained in the Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri was not accessible to Lietzmann. It has since been published with a critical apparatus by Kenyon (*The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*. Fasciculus III. London, 1934). The portions of the Epistle contained in the Papyri are v. 17-vi. 3. 5-14; viii. 15-25, 27-35; ix. 22-32; x. 1-11, 12-xi. 2, 3-12, 13-22, 24-33. This new Pauline text shows close affinity with the *Codex Vaticanus*, and less close with the *Alexandrinus* and *Sinaiticus*. The remark made by Lagrange at the close of a valuable study of the Chester Beatty text of the Gospels in the *Revue Biblique* (January, 1934) seems to be applicable also to the new text of the Epistle to the Romans. *Il ne semble donc pas que la découverte du papyrus Chester Beatty soit destinée à introduire beaucoup de variantes dans les éditions critiques*. In the few cases in "Romans" in which readings not supported by previously known codices have been tentatively put forward by modern critics, the Chester Beatty text gives no support to such "rational" criticism.

For the Vulgate text of "Romans" the critical edition by Wordsworth and White, *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi latine secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi, Partis secundæ fasciculus primus* (Oxford, 1913)—which is quoted in the Commentary as WW.—has been constantly used. The *Editio Minor* (Oxford, 1911) of the Oxford scholars has also been frequently consulted.

The Syriac test of "Romans" used in preparing this work has been usually that contained in the publication of the British and Foreign Bible Society, *The New Testament in Syriac* (London, 1905-1920).

For the Coptic versions the texts of Horner, and that of Thompson mentioned above, have been used.

The student will find it profitable to consult the following studies on matters connected with the text of "Romans":

Lagrange, *La Vulgate latine de l'Épître aux Romains et le texte grec*. Rb. 1916, 225-239.

Bardy, *Le texte de l'Épître aux Romains dans le commentaire d'Origène-Rufin*. Rb. 1920, 229-241.

Bauernfeind, *Der Römerbrieftext des Origenes nach dem Codex von der Goltz (Cod. 184 B 64 des Athosklosters Lawra) untersucht und herausgegeben (Texte und Untersuchungen)*. Leipzig, 1923.

De Bruyne, *Études sur les origines de notre texte latin de Saint Paul*. Rb. 1915, 358-392.

Kenyon, *Recent developments in the textual criticism of the Greek Bible* (Schweich Lectures). London, 1933.

Von Dobschütz, *Zur Liste der Neutestamentlichen Handschriften*. ZNW. 1933, 185-206.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. COMMENTARIES

A. *Older Period*

Origen, *Commentarii in Epistolam ad Romanos* (Summarised version made by Rufinus about 405. The original text written about 245 is lost). Migne, PG, XIV.

Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistle to the Romans* (Preached at Antioch about 390). Migne, PG, LX.

Theodoret, *Opera omnia*: ed. Schulze and Noesselt. Vol. III. Halle, 1771.

The exegetic texts contained in Staab's *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen kirche*. Münster, 1933.

(Writers like John of Damascus, Theophylact, and Euthymius Zigabenus have not been used as independent authorities in the present work. They are, as a rule, mere echoes of Chrysostom).

Ephraem the Syrian. Apart from some fragments, the Commentaries of Ephraem have come down to us only in an Armenian version. Of this there is available a Latin translation, *Commentarii in epistolas D. Pauli a patribus Mekitharistis translati*. Venice, 1893.

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. in epistolas B. Pauli*. Migne, PL, XVII.

Pelagius, see Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions of thirteen Epistles of Saint Paul*. II. Cambridge, 1926.

(The exposition of the Epistle to the Romans erroneously ascribed to St. Jerome (Migne, PL, XXX) and the commentary incorrectly ascribed to Primasius of Hadrumetum (Migne, PL, LXVIII) are apparently modifications of the commentary of Pelagius).

Augustine, the *Inchoata Expositio* deals only with the first seven verses of the Epistle (Migne, XXXV, 2087-2106). Augustine has left us also a commentary on selected texts of the Epistle—*Expositio quarundem propositionum ex epistola ad Romanos* (Migne, PL, XXXV, 2063-2088).

B. *Middle Ages*

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Expositio in omnes S. Pauli Epistolas*.

C. *Tridentine and Post-Tridentine*

(a) Catholic :

Cajetan, *Epistolæ Pauli ad Græcam veritatem castigatæ*. Paris, 1546.

Toletus, *Commentarii et annotationes in epistolam ad Romanos*. Mainz, 1603.

a Lapide, *Commentarii in omnes S. Pauli epistolas*. Antwerp, 1614.

Estius, *In omnes Divi Pauli epistolas, commentarii*. Douay, 1614–1616.

(b) Non-Catholic :

Luther, *Vorlesung über den Römerbrief*, 1515–1516 (Edited by Ficker. I. *Die Glosse*. II. *Die Scholien*. 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1923).

Calvin, *Commentarii in omnes epistolas Pauli Apostoli*. Strassburg, 1539.

D. *Modern*

(a) Catholic :

Calmet, *Commentarius literalis in Epistolam ad Romanos*. Würzburg, 1788.

Klee, *Commentar über das Apostels Paulus Sendschreiben an die Römer*. Mainz, 1830.

Reithmayer, *Commentar zum Briefe an die Römer*. Regensburg, 1845.

Maier, *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Römer*. Freiburg, 1847.

Beelen, *Commentarius in epistolam S. Pauli ad Romanos*. Louvain, 1854.

Bisping, *Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer* (*Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Briefen des Apostels Paulus*, I, 1). Münster, 1854 (3rd ed., 1870).

Agus, *Epistola beati Pauli Apostoli ad Romanos analytice et logice explicata*. Regensburg, 1888.

Schæfer, *Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer*. Münster, 1890.

McEvelly, *An Exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul*. 4th ed. Dublin, 1891.

Cornely, *Epistola ad Romanos*. Paris, 1896.

Rickaby, *Notes on St. Paul*. London, 1898.

Van Steenkiste, *Commentarius in omnes S. Pauli Epistolas*. Vol. I. Bruges, 1892.

Lemonyer, *Epîtres de Saint Paul*. Paris, 1905.

Toussaint, *Epître aux Romains*. Paris, 1913.

- Callan, *The Epistles of St. Paul*. Vol. I. New York, 1922.
 Gutjahr, *Der Brief an die Römer*. Graz and Vienna, 1923–1927.
 Bardenhewer, *Der Römerbrief des hl. Paulus*. Freiburg, 1926.
 Re, *Le Lettere di San Paolo*. Turin, 1926.
 Lattey, *Epistle to the Romans*. (2nd ed.). London, 1927 (= WV).
 Lagrange, *Épître aux Romains* (4th ed.). Paris, 1931.
 Sickenberger, *Der Brief an die Römer* (4th ed.). Bonn, 1932.

(b) Non-Catholic:

- Lipsius, *Der Brief an die Römer* (*Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*. II, 2). Freiburg, 1892.
 Weiss, *Der Brief an die Römer* (*Meyers Kommentar*). Göttingen, 1899.
 Gore, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. London, 1899.
 Parry, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans* (*Cambridge Greek Bible*). Cambridge, 1912.
 Kühl, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. Leipzig, 1913.
 Sanday and Headlam, *A critical and exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (*International Critical Commentary*). 5th ed. Edinburgh, 1914.
 Jülicher, *Der Brief an die Römer* (*Schriften des Neuen Testaments Herausgegeben von J. Weiss*). Göttingen, 1917.
 Van Veldhuizen, *Paulus en zijn Brief an die Romeinen*. Groningen, 1918.
 Pallis, *To the Romans*. Liverpool, 1920.
 Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. 3rd ed., revised by Hauck. Leipzig, 1925.
 Häring, *Der Römerbrief des Apostels Paulus erläutert*. Stuttgart, 1926.
 Althaus, *Der Brief an die Römer*. Göttingen, 1932.
 Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (*Moffatt New Testament Commentary*). London, 1932.
 Barth, *Der Römerbrief*. 6th ed. Munich, 1933.
 Lietzmann, *An die Römer* (*Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*). 4th ed. Tübingen, 1933.

II. OTHER LITERATURE BEARING ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

(Non-Catholic writers are indicated by asterisks)

- Bandas, *The Master-Idea of St. Paul's Epistles*. Bruges, 1925.
 Barnes, *The Martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul*. London, 1933.
 Bartmann, *St. Paulus und St. Jakobus über die Rechtfertigung* (*Biblische Studien*, II, 1). Freiburg, 1897.
 Benz, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus* (*Biblische Studien*, XVII, 3/4). Freiburg, 1912.

- *Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (Edited by Gressmann). Tübingen, 1926.
- *Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*. Göttingen, 1910.
- Cohausz, *Der erlöste Mensch*. Leipzig, 1925.
- Denifle, *Die abendlandischen Schriftausleger bis Luther über Justitia Dei und Justificatio. Quellenbelege. Ergänzungen zu "Luther und Luthertum."* Mainz, 1905.
- Dimmler, *Erlösung*. Kempten, 1921.
- Dubowy, *Klemens von Rom über die Reise Pauli nach Spanien (Biblische Studien, XIX, 3)*. Freiburg, 1914.
- Duperray, *Le Christ dans la vie chrétienne d'après Saint Paul*. Lyons, 1922.
- *Feine, *Der Römerbrief*. Göttingen, 1903.
- Freundorfer, *Erbsünde und Erbtod beim Apostel Paulus (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen)*. Münster, 1927.
- *Grafe, *Das Verhältniss der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salamonis*. Freiburg, 1892.
- *von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. Leipzig, 1921.
- „ *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus und die anderen vorkonstantinischen Briefsammlungen*. Leipzig, 1926.
- „ *Das Alte Testament in den Paulinischen Briefen und in den Paulinischen Gemeinden (Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akad.)*. Leipzig, 1928.
- *Hort, *Prolegomena to the Romans and the Ephesians*. London, 1895.
- *Kümmel, *Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus*. Leipzig, 1929.
- *Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*. London, 1914.
- *Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom*. 2nd. ed. Berlin and Leipzig, 1927.
- *Lohmeyer, *Grundlagen Paulinischer Theologie*. Tübingen, 1929.
- Lortzung, *Die Rechtfertigungslehre Luthers im Lichte der Heiligen Schrift*. Paderborn, 1932.
- Mayer, *Israel in der Heilgeschichte nach Röm. 9–11*.
- *Michel, *Paulus und seine Bibel*. Gütersloh, 1929.
- Murillo, *Paulus et Pauli Scripta*. Rome, 1926.
- Oemmelen, *Zur dogmatischen Auswertung von Röm. v. 12–14*. Münster, 1930.
- Pauels, *Untersuchungen zum Römerbrief*. Bonn, 1927.
- Prat, *La Théologie de Saint Paul*. Sixth and Seventh ed. Paris, 1920–1923.
- Rauer, *Die "Schwachen" in Korinth und Rom nach den Paulusbriefen (Biblische Studien, XXI, 2/3)*. Freiburg, 1923.

- *Roenneke, *Das letzte kapitel des Römerbriefs im Lichte der christlichen Archäologie*. Leipzig, 1927.
- *Roller, *Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe*. Stuttgart, 1933.
- *Schlatter, *Luthers Deutung des Römerbriefs*. Gütersloh, 1928.
- Schumacher, *Die beiden letzten kapitel des Römerbriefes (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen)*. Münster, 1929.
- Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht (Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici)*. Rome, 1926.
- „ *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen kirche*. Münster, 1933.
- *Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. Vol. III. München, 1926.
- Tobac, *Le problème de justification dans Saint Paul (Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis, Dissertationes, II, 3)*. Louvain, 1908.
- Vosté, *Studia Paulina*. Rome, 1928.
- Wobbe, *Der Charis-Gedanke bei Paulus (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, XIII, 3)*. Münster, 1932.

GRAMMARS AND DICTIONARIES

The Author has derived valuable help from the Grammars of Abel (*Grammaire du grec biblique*), Moulton (*A Grammar of New Testament Greek*), Robinson (*A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research*), Blass-Debrunner (*Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*), and Rademacher (*Neutestamentliche Grammatik*), the Lexicons of Preuschen, Abbott, Zorell, Moulton and Milligan, Souter, etc.; Deissmann's *Licht um Osten* (=LO); the notes and discussions on grammar and linguistics generally in the Reviews, *Biblica*, *Biblische Zeitschrift* (=BZ), the *Revue Biblique* (=Rb) and the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (=ZNW), the Lexicon of Preisigke (*Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusrkunden*. Berlin, 1925-1931), and the still incomplete *Wörterbuch* of Gerhard Kittel (*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*).

The full title of books quoted by the author's name only is given in the bibliography.

The following abbreviations are also used in the text :

- SB = Strack-Billerbeck.
 SH = Sanday and Headlam.
 WW = Wordsworth and White.
 WV = Westminster Version.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION, I, 1-17

(1) THE ADDRESS. I, 1-7

1-2. This is one of the longest and most unwieldy of St. Paul's epistolary greetings. His mind seems to be full of thoughts which are competing for expression. For a long time he had been yearning to visit Rome. It was the centre of the heathen world, and it was right that the Apostle of the Gentiles should visit it. The greeting emphasises Paul's heathen apostolate, for in that apostolate was implied his right and duty to address the Romans. Hence, in the same sentence Paul describes himself as "Servant (slave) of Christ Jesus," "a called Apostle," and "set apart for the Gospel of God." "Servant (or slave) of Christ Jesus" does not merely mean "Christian": it designates here one who had received a special commission (not, as yet, defined) from Jesus Christ (*cf.* Phil. i. 1). The determination of the commission, or special service in question is given in the second epithet, κλητὸς ἀπόστολος. Paul is not simply ἀπόστολος, but κλητὸς ἀπόστολος—*i.e.*, a missionary called to his office by the Lord Himself (*cf.* Gal. i. 1). A "called Apostle" is, therefore, more than one who had the qualifications for an Apostle laid down in Acts i. 21 f., and more than an Apostle appointed as Matthias was: he is an Apostle appointed like Peter and the rest of the Twelve, by the direct action of Christ Himself.

The third epithet, ἀφορισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ, is a further determination of Paul's mission: he has been specially set apart to herald forth the Gospel that comes from God (Θεοῦ is genitive of origin). *Cf.* the words of the Holy Spirit in Acts xiii. 2: Ἀφορίσατε δὴ μοι τὸν βαρνάβαν καὶ Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς (*cf.* Jer. i. 5).

That Gospel (*i.e.*, its content) God had already promised by the prophetic writers of the Old Testament, whose writings, unlike works of merely human origin, are "holy" because they were inspired by God, and contain God's words. These holy prophetic writings guarantee the divine character of the Gospel message (*cf.* ch. xvi). The "prophets," whose writings contain the promises of the Gospel, are not merely the Prophets, technically so-called, but include all the "men of God" whose utterances about the Messiah are recorded

in the Old Testament. The absence of the article with γραφαῖς ἁγίαις emphasises the peculiar holiness of the Old Testament Scriptures¹—the holiness, as pointed out above, that comes from their Divine Author and contents.

- 3-4. The Gospel message is concerned with the Son of God (περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ). On His human side He is of Davidic stock (ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα).² The ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ emphasises, on the one hand, the human birth of Our Lord, and, on the other, the fulfilment in Him of the ancient prophecies which make the Messiah a scion of the House of David.³

Τοῦ ὁρισθέντος etc.; the article shows the identity of the subject of this clause with the subject of the clause τοῦ γενομένου, etc.; ὁρισθέντος means "shown forth," "set forth," "marked out," "declared." The *prædestinatus* of the Vulgate ought to be *destinatus*—for προορισθέντος is a reading that first appears in Eusebius and has never found much support. There is no real sense in speaking of Christ as "predestined" to be the Son of God: He was, from the beginning, the Son of God. Ὅρισθέντος seems rather to mean "designated," or marked out,⁴ and the simplest way of understanding the whole phrase ὁρισθέντος . . . νεκρῶν is to regard it as referring to the proof or declaration of Christ's divinity given in the miraculous events that have accompanied the preaching of the Apostles since the Resurrection of Our Lord. The divinity of Christ was declared "by miracles wrought by the Holy Spirit since the Resurrection from the dead" (Cf. Mark xvi. 20).

Ἐν δυνάμει is to be understood instrumentally, and δύναιμι is here used collectively of the manifestations of divine power which marked the early stages of the preaching of the Gospel (cf. ch. xv. 19: ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου). These manifestations of power were κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης—i.e., miracles wrought by the Holy Spirit (the "Spirit of holiness") and in conformity with His character—miracles, that is, of consecration and sanctification. The use of πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης rather than πνεῦμα ἁγίου, or πνεῦμα simply, is intended to emphasise the specific character of the miracles in question. The δύναιμι includes not merely the wondrous phenomena

¹ Cf. Abel, § 29a, Rem. iii.

² There is nothing corresponding to the Vulgate *ei* in the Greek.

³ Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 8; Acts ii. 30; Heb. vii. 14; cf. the narratives of the Divine Infancy in Matthew and Luke.

⁴ Lietzmann quotes Xenophon, Mem. iv. 6, 4, as showing that ὁρίζειν τίνα τι means to determine, or define an individual as something. Lietzmann thinks, however, that the word here means to appoint to a position or office.

of the first Christian Pentecost, but all the charismatic happenings, and other tokens of the activity of the Holy Spirit, which marked the life of the early Church (*Cf.* 1 Cor. xii-xiv).

The "creed-passage," 1 Tim. iii. 16 :

ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί
ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι,

has often been compared with the present clause ; there, as here, we have a reference both to the humanity of Christ, and to the proof of Christ's divinity furnished by the miraculous workings of the Holy Spirit. Jesus "was shown forth in the flesh (= human nature), and justified (shown to be justified in His claim to divinity) by the Spirit (by the miracles of the Holy Spirit)."

Ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, means "since the Resurrection," not, "by the Resurrection." The Resurrection in question is that of Christ ; since His Resurrection the divine Sonship of Christ has been made evident to the world by the wondrous deeds of the Holy Spirit. The miracles of the Spirit have shown that Christ, as He had foretold, had ascended to the Father, and sent the Holy Spirit to His disciples (*Cf.* John xvi. 7 ff).

It is not correct to take κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγίωσύνης as meaning "on the side of His Divinity," as if it were balanced against κατὰ σάρκα. The divinity of Christ has been already sufficiently expressed by calling Him Son of God (τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ). Paul is not thinking here of the Resurrection as a proof of Christ's divinity. Neither can he mean that Christ was "set up" or "established" by the Resurrection as Son of God. He is thinking rather, as has been said, of the striking declaration of the divine Sonship of Christ contained in the works wrought by the Holy Spirit since the Resurrection.

Ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγίωσύνης is practically equivalent to ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου, just as ἡ δικαιοσύνη τῆς πίστεως (ch. iv. 11) is the same as ἡ κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνη (Heb. xi. 7).¹

Paul uses here ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν rather than ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν, because, though he has immediately in view the Resurrection of Christ, there is implied in that Resurrection the resurrection of all men (1 Cor. xv. 20-22).

Many other explanations of v. 4 have been put forward.

¹ This use of κατὰ πνεῦμα, as equivalent to πνεύματος, and κατὰ πίστιν as = πίστεως recalls such usages as οἱ καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιηταί, Acts xvii. 28, and Papyrus phrases like ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς τόποις (P. Tebtunis, 27, 5) = "in our localities." See Abel, Gram. 49 i.

It has often been proposed to take ἐν δυνάμει with υἱοῦ θεοῦ as if the sense were, "Son of God in power," or "mighty Son of God." Many commentators take, "according to the Spirit of holiness" as a counterpoise to κατὰ σάρκα, in the sense, "on the side of His Divinity." The "Spirit of Holiness" in this view would be the Divinity of Christ as Holiness Itself. That substantial Holiness sanctifies, through the Hypostatic Union, the humanity of Christ, which, therefore, in virtue of its *sanctitas substantiva*, cannot remain subject to sin through death. Thus, the πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης implies the necessity of Christ's Resurrection, and by His Resurrection (ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν being taken causally) Christ is shown forth, or declared "the mighty Son of God."

In this explanation the sense of v. 4 would be: "The Incarnate Son of God was established, or declared, Mighty Son of God, as befitted His divine nature—by the Resurrection."

It would not be profitable to enumerate here the various other theories of v. 4 that exegetes have put forward. Most of them differ only slightly from one or the other of the two views here set forth. It is interesting to note that Chrysostom sees in v. 4 several proofs of the divinity of Christ—one of them being the Resurrection—through which Christ "destroyed the tyranny of death."

Theodoret's explanation: ὥρισθη καὶ ἀπεδέχθη τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸς διὰ τῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος ἐνεργουμένης δυνάμεως μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, seems to be identical with the first view put forward above.

In the designation "Jesus Christ, Our Lord," the Incarnate Son of God, the theme of God's Gospel, gets His full title. "Jesus"—the personal name given to Him by God's messenger (Matth. i. 21), suggests the redemptive purpose of His earthly life: "Christ" (the "Anointed"; Hebrew, *Mashiah*; Aramaic, *M'shiha*) is a title of office and dignity. He is "Our Lord," because He has purchased us by His blood, and because the Father has given us to Him (John x. 29 f; xvii. 6, etc.), and has subjected all things to Him (Eph. i. 19-21; Col. i. 16 ff; Phil. ii. 9 ff). The whole title, "Jesus Christ Our Lord," is in apposition to υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.

5. Paul now returns to the thought of his divinely-given Apostolate. It is that Apostolate that permits, and even compels, him to have missionary dealings with Rome.

Ἐλάβομεν is the epistolary plural: χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν is a hendiadys—"the gracious gift of the Apostolate" (ἀποστολικήν χάριν). He had received that Apostolate im-

mediately from Christ Himself (Gal. i. 1), and the purpose for which it was given was to bring the heathen world to acceptance of the Gospel (εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). The humble submission of the Gentiles to the Gospel would be a glorification of the Name of Jesus. The success of the Apostolate would inevitably bring glory to Him Who had sent Paul as His Herald to the heathen (Cf. Acts ix. 15; xv. 26; xxi. 13).

Ὑπακοὴ πίστεως may mean, either obedience to the Faith (i.e., humble acceptance of the truths of Faith, or of the Gospel), or obedience consisting in faith. The second meaning is supported by Theodoret and many moderns, and as it is not quite clear that πίστις without the article can mean the truths of faith, this second meaning seems to be the more probable (Cf. xvi. 26; x. 16; Acts vi. 7).

Among the Gentile peoples (the ἔθνη = **הַגּוֹיִם**) to whom the Gospel was to be brought, are the Romans ("among whom are ye also")—a clear implication that at least the majority of the Christians at Rome were converts from heathenism.

Κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is in apposition to ὑμεῖς; as Christians the Romans are called by Christ to His Kingdom, and thus chosen to be His own: Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is genitive of possession.¹ The Romans, as Aquinas notes, are not said to be *vocati a Jesu Christo*, but *vocati Jesu Christi*: as called by God they *belong to Jesus Christ*.

6-7. It is only now that Paul completes the address which he began in v. 1.

Instead of ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ some MSS. (Codd. G and g) have ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ, and there are indications that this reading was widely adopted in antiquity. There is no compelling reason, however, for regarding it as the primitive text; εἶναι ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ has not a genuine Pauline ring.²

Κλητοῖς ἀγίοις: all Christians are beloved of God, because they were called to the Faith through God's love. Moreover, they are ἅγιοι because they possess sanctifying grace as a result of their call. They were called because God loved

¹ Cf. viii. 33, ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ, and Is. liv. 13, διδασκτοὶ θεοῦ.

² There are apparently three types of text in v. 7: (a) πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ: (b) πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ: (c) πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ. Type (c) has probably arisen from (b), in order to give some concrete sense to τοῖς οὖσιν. It is possible—but only just possible—that Origen read (b): type (a) has much better manuscript support than (b) or (c), and the omission of ἐν Ῥώμῃ in the course of scribal transmission is paralleled in the text-history of I, 15. The problem of Eph. i. 1 is analogous. Lietzmann thinks that the omission of the name of the Church to which a Pauline Letter was addressed was generally due to the desire of the scribes to show that the message of such Pauline Letter was intended for the whole Church.

them, and they were made holy because they were called. The epithets "called" and "holy" give expression to Paul's sense of the dignity and the excellence of the Roman Christians; but they may be intended also to recall the epithet he has just given to himself, κλητός ἀπόστολος (v. 1), and to suggest that, as it was Paul's duty to teach the Gentiles, so it was the duty of all Gentiles to hearken to his teaching.

Chrysostom notes the repetition of κλητός in this context: it is intended to remind the Romans of the greatness of their privilege as Christians.

Χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη is the usual Pauline greeting; it has often been explained as a sort of fusion of the usual Greek (χαίρε) and Hebrew (*shalôm* = "peace") greetings. It is, however, more probable that in the formula χάρις is the gracious love of God, and εἰρήνη the peace which results therefrom.¹ In Gal. v. 22 χαρά and εἰρήνη are reckoned as part of the "fruit" of the Spirit. The "grace" and "peace," that Paul wishes to the Romans, spring from the Father and are communicated to men by Christ.

Here, for the fourth time in seven verses, the full name, Jesus Christ, is used. That name was, of course, constantly on the lips of the Apostle. The equality in being of the Father and Christ is here clearly expressed.

(2) INTRODUCTION TO THE EPISTLE

Paul's reason for writing to the Romans. I, 8-15

8. To secure the goodwill and attention of his Roman readers, Paul assures them of his deep respect for their excellence as Christians, and of his interest in their spiritual welfare.

Πρῶτον μὲν is not balanced by ἔπειτα δέ; and it probably means here, "first of all," or, "before all." Thanksgiving on account of the good qualities of his readers is a familiar feature of Paul's letters (cf. 1 Cor. i. 4; Phil. i. 3, etc.). He thanks God for all of them—for the whole Community, rather than for each several member of the Church at Rome. The thanksgiving is made to his own God (τῷ θεῷ μου: not quite as in Is. vii. 13)—the God to whom he belongs; and it is offered through our Mediator, Jesus Christ. As Aquinas (*ad loc.*) puts it: *Eodem ordine debet gratiarum actio in Deum recurrere quo gratiæ in nos deveniunt—quod quidem est per Jesum Christum.*² The special reason for thanksgiving is

¹ Compare ch. viii. 6; xvi. 20; John xiv. 27, etc.

² Cf. Eph. v. 20; Col. iii. 17; 1 Thess. v. 16.

that vigour and constancy of Roman faith of which "the whole world"—the world in which Paul has laboured—speaks. Chrysostom notes: οὐκ ἔιπε Δηλοῦται, ἀλλὰ καταγγέλλεται, ὡς πάντων ἐν στόμασιν αὐτοὺς ἔχόντων. "Ὅτι here means "because": πίστις is obviously *fides qua creditur*.

- 9-10. To God, Who alone could know the secret thoughts of his soul, Paul appeals to bear witness that he has had the Romans constantly in mind, and that he has long been planning to visit Rome. The solemn invocation of God shows the intensity of Paul's interest in the Romans. The centre of the heathen world could not fail to be a goal of the Apostle's longing.

Paul's service of God in preaching the Good News about the Son of God is given with heart and soul (ἐν τῷ πνεύματι): Paul is an enthusiastic Evangelist not only in preaching, but in prayer; and in his prayer he is mindful even of Gentiles to whom he has not preached.

ὥς = ὅτι: Vulgate, *quod*. It is, perhaps, better to put a comma after ποιοῦμαι, and regard πάντοτε as resuming the ἀδολεῖπτως of the preceding clause. The *memento* for the Romans is followed immediately by a prayer for the grace of being permitted to visit the Church at Rome. The prayer is full of humble resignation to the Divine Will, as we see from the use of εἰ πως—instead of ἵνα or ὅπως, and from ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ.

"Ἡδὴ ποτέ" = "at long last": cf. Phil. iv. 10: ἐνοδοῦσθαι occurs again in the New Testament only in 1 Cor. xvi. 2 and 3 John 2. In the active it means, "prepare a good path"; in the passive (as here) it means in the κοινή, "to have luck," "to succeed." The Vulgate *prosperum iter habeam*, suggesting the derivation of ἐνοδωθήσομαι, may, however, possibly convey correctly what was in Paul's mind when he used the word.

- 11-12. As Apostle of the Gentiles Paul desires to visit Rome to exercise there his Apostolic office. By the exercise of that office in Rome he hopes to bring spiritual advantage to the Romans, and, at the same time, to promote his own spiritual progress. Χάρισμα πνευματικόν is some gift, however small, out of that treasure of χάρις which Paul has received; it might be any form of instruction, exhortation, or encouragement which would help to deepen or strengthen the spiritual life of the Romans. Paul, by his office is an administrator of the store-house of God's treasures (1 Cor. iv. 1), and however ardent and widely known is the faith of the Romans, it may still be intensified, and become still more active and fruitful.

Μεταδῶ, instead of δῶ, suggests that Paul gives not of his own, but of what he has received : this thought is not fully conveyed by the Vulgate, *impertiar*.

Ἐἰς τὸ στήριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς is final : for the phrase *cf.* chapter xvi. 25 ; 1 Thess. iii. 2, etc.

Lest his words might be taken as a hint that Paul had some doubts regarding Roman faith, and lest he might seem to be wanting in modesty, he hastens to make it clear that, in visiting Rome, he aims at the strengthening of his own faith, as well as of theirs : συμπαράκληθῆναι is, in somewhat loose epistolary construction, due to attraction of στήριχθῆναι, which it is intended to correct, or modify.

Ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ makes clear the sense of ἐν ἀλλήλοις the equality in function of Paul's faith and the faith of the Romans is here emphasised, and all suggestion of arrogance or undue assertion of authority on Paul's part is removed.

13. Ὅν θέλω, etc. : this formula of asseveration appears often in the Pauline letters : *cf.* ch. xi. 25 ; 1 Cor. x. 1 ; xii. 1 ; 2 Cor. i. 8 ; 2 Thess. iv. 13.

Paul, on the one hand, emphasises his frequently-formed intention of visiting Rome, and, on the other, announces the precise purpose of his hoped-for visit. He has already said that he wished to visit the Romans for the mutual encouragement and consolation which that visit would produce. Now he adds the more definite thought that he hoped to gain at Rome also some Apostolic "profit"—*i.e.*, gain there new members for the Christian community, and, at the same time, acquire further merit for himself.

The clause, καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, is to be taken as a parenthesis. Hitherto his mission in the East has kept him from visiting Rome (*cf.* Acts xix. 21).¹ As long as he still could find districts where the Faith had not been preached, he was unwilling to visit a flourishing Church that others had founded.

The καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν implies that the Roman Christians are, in the main, converts from heathenism.

14. Paul's duty to preach the Gospel is universal : he is under Apostolic obligation towards all (ὀφειλέτης εἰμί : for ὀφειλέτης *cf.* viii. 12 ; xv. 27 ; Gal. v. 3). As he says in 1 Cor. ix. 16 : "If I preach the Gospel, that is to me no ground for boasting : it is imposed as a duty on me, and woe to me if I preach not the Gospel !" To all he must preach, whether they are "Greeks" (those whose civilisation is Greek), or

¹ For "prohibition" of a somewhat different kind in the execution of missionary plans, see Acts xvi. 6-7.

"Barbarians" (non-Greeks); whether they are sophisticated intellectuals familiar with all the learning of the time, or simple, uneducated folk. In the classification Paul, writing in Greek to the Roman Church, does not, of course, include the Romans among the "Barbarians." The four groups here named suggest the universal scope of Paul's mission. Here again it is clearly implied that the Roman Christians had been chiefly recruited from heathenism.

15. Οὕτως = "the matter being thus," "accordingly" (cf. vi. 11).

Since Paul's obligation is to all heathens, he is ready to work in Rome: τὸ πρόθυμον = ἡ προθυμία: ἐστίν is to be supplied: κατ' ἐμέ = "in so far as it rests with me."¹ As far, then, as Paul is concerned, he is ready and willing to preach at Rome, but his visit to Rome depends on the "will of God." The εὐαγγελίσασθαι in question, is obviously not the sending of the present letter to the Romans. The letter is intended to serve as a sort of prelude to the evangelising work at Rome.

In xv. 14-24 Paul discusses again in some detail the apparent departure from his policy of not building on foundations laid by others (xv. 20) implied in addressing an Apostolic letter to the Romans, and in a visit to the Roman Church.² The position of Rome, as the centre of the great heathen world-empire, would, in itself, explain and justify Paul's desire to visit the imperial city. But, further, as Paul explains (xv. 23), there is no longer any great unworked missionary centre in the East, and he must, therefore, seek a new field of Apostolic labour in the far West. It is but natural that he should visit Rome, and gain what spiritual profit he can from such a visit, on his way to the West (xv. 24). The spiritual gain from his projected visit will be made more secure and abundant by this letter of preparation.

(3) THEME OF THE EPISTLE

God's justice revealed in the Gospel. I, 16-17

16. Paul gives here a further reason for his readiness to preach at Rome. Even there—centre of the world, as it was—he would not be ashamed to preach Christ crucified—that *μωρία* of the Gospel which he had preached at Corinth (1 Cor. i.

¹ κατ' ἐμέ is here practically equivalent to ἐμοῦ: cf. ἡ καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστις, your faith (Eph. i. 15). Abel quotes P. Leip. 31, 5: τὸ κατ' ἐμέ ἡμισυ μέρος = "my half."

² The reading found in many Western MSS. which substitutes here ἐν ὑμῖν for ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ is due to the same tendency that led to the omission of ἐν Ῥώμῃ above in v. 7.

22-23; cf. Gal. vi. 14). The "Gospel" of which he is not ashamed is the Gospel-message generally. For ἐπαισχύνομαι with accusative, cf. Luke ix. 26 ; 2 Tim. i. 8, 16, etc.

There is, indeed, no need to be ashamed of the "Gospel," for it is a "Power of God"—a power or force which comes from God and manifests itself as such: it is a powerful instrument, or agent, or force in the service of God, and it produces, or effects, "salvation" (εἰς σωτηρίαν = εἰς σωτηρίαν ἄγουςα: cf. 2 Cor. vii. 10, μετάνοια εἰς σωτηρίαν). Its scope is universal; it is meant for all—whether Jew or Greek (i.e., heathen)—who believe.¹

ῥουδαῖοι τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλλησι: "first" refers here merely to order of enumeration—not to order of dignity, nor to measure of grace conferred. As Chrysostom says: τάξεως ἐστὶ τιμὴ μόνον τὸ πρῶτον. The Jews did, as a matter of history, first hear and receive the Gospel.²

The Gospel is not a mere set of maxims or formulæ, nor a philosophical system: there is in it a divine power which is experienced in the grace imparted to the believer, and that power produces σωτηρία—the rescuing of men from the death of sin, and the quickening of them unto the life of grace. The "salvation" of which Paul here speaks is rather *salus inchoata* than eternal life.

The salvation procurable through the Gospel in no way depends on racial origin or national boundaries: it is available for all who accept the Gospel with a living faith.

17. That the Gospel is "a power of God unto salvation" Paul proves here by the assertion that in the Gospel (i.e., by it), wherever it is preached, the justice of God is shown forth. Paul here enunciates the theme of the Epistle—the justice of God is through faith unto those that believe.

The "justice of God" here is the justice that comes from God (the genitive is a genitive of origin—like δύναμις θεοῦ above): it is the same as ἡ ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη, of Phil. iii. 9—which is also ἡ διὰ πίστεως χριστοῦ [δικαιοσύνη]. It is, then not the justice which belongs to God Himself as an attribute, but a reflection of, or outflow from, that justice: it is a quality in men which has its source in God. It is something in the δίκαιος by which he lives: it is not the result of a mere classification. It is the justice which God imparts to men in the grace of justification. Paul carefully distinguishes

¹ Cf. what is said in 1 Cor. i. 18 of the λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ: τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις μωρία ἐστίν, τοῖς δὲ σωζομένοις ἡμῖν δύναμις θεοῦ ἐστίν. Cf. also 1 Cor. ii. 4: ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά μου οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις ἀλλ' ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως. Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 20; 1 Thess. i. 5.

² Marcion omitted the πρῶτον—as might be expected. See Tertullian, *Contra Marc.* v. 13.

it from "our own justice" (ἰδικὰ δικαιοσύνη: x. 3), "the justice which is of the Law" (x. 5; Phil. iii. 9)—the justice, that is, which a man might seek to secure by his own effort, either by observing the positive Divine Law, or by observing the natural law. That "human justice" is a mere illusion, and does not deserve the name of "justice."¹ But the justice of God by which He makes men just is a real condition of men, a genuine state of supernatural elevation which makes them like unto God. As Trent puts it: "The one formal cause [of justification] is the justice of God—not that by which He Himself is just, but that by which He makes us just—that, namely, through which, when we are endowed by Him therewith, we are made new again in the spirit of our mind, and are not merely regarded as just, but are truthfully called just, and truly are just" (Sess. vi. *De Justif.*, c. 7).

This explanation of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ completely excludes the Lutheran theory of a merely imputed justice. A justice which God communicates to men, and produces in men, cannot be something merely externally imputed, and compatible, therefore, with the persistence of sin; as an inherent quality of genuine inner holiness and justice, it supposes the removal and abolition of sin. Luther put forward the surprising theory that, up to his own day, every commentator except Augustine had explained the "justice of God" of which Paul here speaks, as God's own justice—especially His avenging justice (the *ira Dei*). Denifle in his *Luther und Luthertum*, had no difficulty in showing, on the contrary, that every commentator of the Middle Ages (except, perhaps, Abelard) explains the *justitia Dei* in practically the same way as Trent.

It would be obviously absurd to suppose that the "justice of God" in the present context could be God's avenging justice, or anger. That avenging justice would not bring σωτηρία, but ἀπώλεια. But Paul clearly means here that the Gospel reveals something which rescues men from destruction, and gives them assurance of "safety"—something, therefore, that brings, or guarantees, help and salvation.

In the Gospel, which is "a power of God unto salvation," there is revealed for him who believes the "justice" which begins from faith and is given to the believer. To participate in the σωτηρία, which the Gospel makes accessible, men must

¹ The rendering of δικαιοσύνη by "justness," which the Westminster Version employs, is not adopted in this book. The translation "justice" is, at times, wanting in clearness, but the Commentary will, it is hoped, make the meaning of "justice" clear in each individual case.

believe the Gospel-message : they must give to that message the "obedience of faith" (i. 5). That ὑπακοή πίστεως implies, in addition to the assent of faith, the reception of baptism, and the conforming of life to the teachings of the Gospel. Merely theoretical faith would not be genuine faith for Paul, any more than for James (Jas. ii. 17). The good works of the genuine believer are themselves, in certain aspects, acts of faith. In the life of one who is, in the full sense, a practical believer, there is manifestly present the Divine power that the Gospel contains—the power that is given to everyone who genuinely believes—whether he was formerly Jew or heathen ("Greek," as often in the New Testament = "heathen").

It seems best to take εἰς πίστιν as equivalent to the εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας of iii. 22. "Faith" personified is the totality of believers. As faith is the necessary pre-condition for the reception of justice, justice is here said to be ἐκ πίστεως. The sense is that in the Gospel a justice of God is revealed which is imparted on the basis of faith to all believers (cf. Gal. iii. 22). In this view ἐκ πίστεως is to be read immediately with δικαιοσύνη, not with ἀποκαλύπτεται : both ἐκ πίστεως and εἰς πίστιν can be taken as co-ordinate determinations of δικαιοσύνη—"a justice which is through faith, and is given to those that believe, is therein revealed."

Others regard ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν as a formula parallel to ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν of 2 Cor. iii. 18 (cf. 2 Cor. ii. 16, ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον), as if the sense were (according to Cornelius à Lapide)—*justitia quæ incipit, alitur, augescit per fidem in dies crescentem, donec credentem in salutem perducatur*.

Many commentators, refusing to admit that εἰς πίστιν means εἰς τοὺς πιστεύοντας, explain that justice progresses εἰς πίστιν because Faith is not merely its principle, but its standard, or measure. In this view the sense of the whole phrase would be—"on the basis of faith, and leading to higher faith" (So Lietzmann).

It seems best, however, all things considered, to take εἰς πίστιν in the sense explained above, "unto believers." Obviously ἐν αὐτῷ refers to the Gospel. There is revealed then in the Gospel that justice which has faith for its "beginning basis and root," and is given to those that genuinely believe. Trent explains the sense in which men are justified by faith : "We are said to be justified by faith, *quia fides est humanæ salutis initium, fundamentum et radix omnis justificationis, sine qua impossibile est placere Deo, et ad filiorum ejus consortium pervenire*" (Sess. vi., c. viii).

The importance of faith is emphasised by a saying of the

Prophet Habacuc, which Paul elsewhere also quotes (Gal. iii. 11; Heb. x. 38): "He that is just through faith, lives" (Hab. ii. 4): δίκαιος is obviously to be joined here immediately with ἐκ πίστεως, not with ζήσεται. Some texts add μοῦ (ὁ δίκαιος μοῦ) from the LXX. The rendering, "The just will live by faith," though closer in meaning to the Habacuc passage, does not so clearly express Paul's point of view—he that is just by faith (*i.e.*, he that has received justification), will live (*i.e.*, will truly live, will enjoy the life of grace and glory). Note here how ζήσεται is parallel to σωτηρίᾳ, and δίκαιος to δικαιοσύνη. The quotation from Habacuc shows that the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith cannot be regarded as something utterly novel and strange, seeing that it is taught in the Old Testament.¹

The justice, then, which is revealed in the Gospel is a justice that makes men "just" who previously were "unjust": it transforms men who were God's enemies into friends and children of God, and heirs, in hope, of eternal life (*Cf.* Trent. Sess. vi., *De Justif.*, cap. vii. 4).

This justice is not dependent on man's own effort: it is a gracious gift of God, given in view of man's free acceptance of the Gospel-message by faith. The justice is manifested in the Gospel: it is received by faith, and it is intended for all that believe (iii. 22). The Gospel received by faith is a living power that leads to salvation those that believe.

The beginning of salvation is here, then, spoken of as "the justice of God." The faith, by which the Gospel is received is not man's work, but God's—as St. John puts it: Τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος (John vi. 29). Thus the process of justification in all its stages is the work of divine grace—as Trent says: *Nihil eorum quæ justificationem præcedunt, sive fides sive opera, ipsam justificationis gratiam promeretur* (*De Justif.*, c. viii).

This same teaching is very clearly expressed also in Eph. ii. 8 f; Tit. iii. 5, and Phil. ii. 13.

¹ A saying of Rabbi Nachman ben Isaak in the Talmud Tract *Makhot* (24a) makes Hab. ii. 4 a compendium of all the Commandments. See SB. iii, 543.

A. DOGMATIC SECTION

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. I, 18-XI, 36

[The main theme of this section has been announced in verses 16-17 above.]

The Gospel is a power unto salvation for all that believe. Since faith is the necessary precondition for the energising of the power that is in the Gospel, the whole section is, at the same time, an exposition of the doctrine of justification by faith. Paul shows at length how greatly men were in need of the salvation to be received through the Gospel. The need of *soteria* is made evident by a description of the moral wretchedness of the Gentile world generally (i. 18-32). That a similar need existed also in the Jewish world—in spite of the Law of Moses—is shown convincingly in ii. 1-iii. 20.

Some way of escape from sin and return to God must then be made accessible to heathen and to Jew alike. This is the way of justification by faith which Paul goes on to describe in detail in iii. 21-iv. 25—emphasising strongly the Old Testament foundation of his teaching. In v. 1-vi. 13 the concrete aspects of the Christian life—the life of those who have received justification through faith—are analysed. In the fourth portion of this section (vii. 1-viii. 38) the Christian life is still further analysed and explained by contrast with the conditions of Sin and of bondage to the Law, which preceded it. The slavery of the Old Dispensation is contrasted with the freedom of Christianity, and with the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Christian considered in its nature and effects. The final section (ix-xi) deals with the problems of God's Providence towards Israel.

I. UNIVERSAL NEED OF SALVATION. I, 18-III, 20

a. THE CORRUPTION OF THE HEATHEN WORLD. I, 18-32

(1) *Heathen Idolatry*. I, 18-23

18. Ἀποκαλύπτεται is not to be completed by ἐν αὐτῷ (in the Gospel). The revelation of God's anger is made in the moral degradation of the Gentiles depicted in vv. 24 ff. The anger is revealed from heaven—i.e., it is sent out from the throne

of God—against every kind of godlessness and injustice, every kind of irreligion and immorality. The iniquity against which God's anger goes forth is described as the iniquity of men who hold down, or hold back, the truth (*i.e.*, ethico-religious truth, the truth which is implied in that knowledge of God which God has put within man's reach by natural revelation) by ἀδικία—by sin of every kind. The holding back of truth is the preventing of truth being put into practice, or the stifling of truth (*Cf.* John i. 5).

The precise meaning of ἀσέβεια and of ἀδικία in this verse is a matter of controversy. The traditional view refers ἀσέβεια to the sphere of religion, and ἀδικία to that of morality : in this view ἀσέβεια is traced back to ἀδικία as its source.

Some commentators (*e.g.*, Toletus) take ἀσέβεια as the turning from God to creatures, and ἀδικία as the injustice which is contained in idolatry.

Cornely regards ἀσέβεια and ἀδικία as designating generally all kinds of sins—for every sin, he points out, is “godlessness” as involving contempt of God, and “injustice” as violating the divinely-established order.

Others take both ἀσέβεια and ἀδικία as offences against religion—regarding ἀσέβεια as both theoretical and practical turning away from God, and ἀδικία as the injustice towards God which idolatry implies.

The abstract terms are used, apparently, to show that the sins themselves, rather than those that commit them, are the objects of God's anger. The two words, then, may be taken as describing the irreligious attitude of the heathen. “Those who hold down the truth by injustice” are heathens, not Jews. Κατεχόντων conveys the idea “imprison,” “hold down,” “hold fast,” and the use of the word here insinuates that the heathens *de facto* still have some knowledge of the truth.

There seems to be no good reason for giving κατέχειν here the sense, “reject,” “put away”—as if it were implied that the heathens have no true knowledge of God. Paul nowhere asserts that the heathens have no true theoretical knowledge of God. When he speaks of them as not knowing God (*cf.* Gal. iv. 8 ; 1 Thess. iv. 5), he is referring to practical knowledge of God. It is the ordinary teaching of theology that man has normally some elementary knowledge of God.

19. Paul has just spoken of that knowledge of God which men have through natural revelation. He goes on to discuss now the medium of that knowledge.

The γνωστόν τοῦ θεοῦ is variously explained : (a) what is known to men generally about God—as the Vulgate has it,

quod notum est Dei (cf. Chrysostom, Cornely, etc.) ; (b) what is to be known, what is knowable, about God.¹

(b) seems to be the correct interpretation, and the γνωστόν is best taken in the context as that which is knowable by unaided human reason. The ἐν αὐτοῖς does not mean that the knowledge in question is found in a few highly cultured individuals only, but rather that it is to be found in the heathen generally. Thus ἐν αὐτοῖς must mean either "among them," or "in their inner selves" (in their spirit, or consciousness, or heart). The knowledge of God among the heathen, or in the heathen mind (cf. νοούμενα, v. 20) is possible because God's creation is set before the eyes of all, so that, as Chrysostom says, all—"learned and unlearned, Scythian and Barbarian, gazing with their eyes on the beauty of things visible, can rise up to God." By looking on the visible world they can see the invisible (ἀόρατα—καθορᾶται). By natural revelation, then, God has made manifest what is naturally known about Himself.

20. The γὰρ shows that there is here an explanation. The ἀόρατα of God—that is, the attributes of God generally, and, in particular, those about to be named (eternal power and divinity), though in themselves invisible, are clearly seen (καθορᾶται stronger than ὁρᾶται) since the creation of the world, "through the works" (i.e., through created things) ; the divine qualities are grasped intellectually (νοούμενα) in the works of creation : νοούμενα is to be taken both with τοῖς ποιήμασιν and καθορᾶται. The phenomena of nature, are apprehended by the senses, and their implications (including the divine factors which they reflect) are grasped by reason.

Νοούμενα (from νοέω, to grasp with the νοῦς) refers to intellectual knowledge, as distinct from sense-perception. *Intelligenda* would give a better sense, perhaps, than *intellecta*, in the Vulgate.²

Τοῖς ποιήμασιν = instrumental dative : the "works" are the means by which the knowledge is reached. Note the Vulgate : *per ea quæ facta sunt*.

Ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου denotes the moment at which God's

¹ Ἄγνωστον in the philosophical language of Plato and Aristotle means that which is not a subject of knowledge: γνωστόν means, then, what *may* be an object of knowledge, what is knowable. Elsewhere in the New Testament, γνωστόν = "known."

² On νοούμενα Lietzmann aptly quotes Plato, *Republic* vi. 507, τὰ μὲν δὴ ὁρᾶσθαι φαμεν, νοεῖσθαι δ' οὐ τὰς δ' αὖτὶς ἰδέας νοεῖσθαι μὲν, ὁρᾶσθαι δ' οὐ.

He also quotes, in reference to the thought of verse 20 generally, the Stoic text in the *Griechisches Lesebuch* (ii, 196, 11) of von Wilamowitz ; ταῦτα χρὴ καὶ περὶ θεοῦ διανοεῖσθαι . . . διότι πάση θνητῇ φύσει γενόμενος ἀθεώρητος ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων θεωρεῖται, Cf. Cicero, *Tuscul.* i. 28, 68-70.

self-manifestation began: the phrase is to be read with καθορᾶται. "Since world-creation" would give the sense more precisely than, "since the creation of the world."

Estius and others suppose that κτίσις here means "creature," or "created thing," and explain ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου as expressing the means by which knowledge of God is procured. But κτίσις κόσμου would be a very awkward way of expressing "created world." Moreover, a source of knowledge would be determined by ἐξ or διὰ, rather than by ἀπὸ; or the means by which knowledge could be procured would be put in the dative. Further, in this view of Estius, there would be little or no difference between ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου and τοῖς ποιήμασιν and the use of the former phrase would be unmeaning.

The Vulgate rendering, *a creatura mundi*, can also mean, "since world-creation"—for *creatura* is occasionally used in the sense of "creating," "act of creating" (See *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, iv. 116).

The attributes of God particularly testified to by His works are eternal power and divinity. The power is the creative power which produced the "works"; and since that power precedes the being of creatures, He Who wields it is eternal. The "divinity" is variously explained as the loftiness and majesty of God, or the absolute perfection of His being. Possibly ἄδιος ought to be taken with both δύναμις and θεϊότης (—a *hapax leg.*).¹

Paul does not explain how precisely these attributes become known "through the works." Possibly he has in view a process of inference, like the argument from Causality (the Cosmological Argument). As in Acts xiv. 17; xvii. 22, the wisdom, holiness, and justice of God might also have been here mentioned as easily to be inferred from His works.

Verse 20 is the Scriptural basis of the Vatican definition (*Vaticanum*, Sess. iii., *De fide*, cap. 2): *Ecclesia tenet ac docet Deum rerum omnium principium et finem naturali humanæ rationis lumine e rebus creatis certo cognosci posse.*

Since, then, the heathens had the phenomena of creation before them, and could see God therein by the use of their own reason, they had no excuse (ἀναπολογήτοι) for failing to know God. 1 Cor. i. 21: ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν θεόν, does not contradict the present passage, for it merely states that men did not use their reason so as to know God rightly.

¹ Cf. with v. 20 the passage Wisdom xiii. 1-9, especially xiii. 5, ἐκ γὰρ μεγέθους καὶ καλλοῦντῃς κτισμάτων ἀναλόγως ὁ γενεσιουργὸς αὐτῶν θεωρεῖται. *Vide infra.*

21. Yet, though the Gentiles knew God, they refused to give Him honour as their Creator and to give Him thanks for His blessings and favours. Turning away from God to creatures they "became futile in their thoughts"—that is, they gave themselves up to thoughts which were a mockery of truth. Their heart (*i.e.*, according to Hebrew usage, their mind) in its futile turning away from truth, was darkened—given over to still greater folly, to still greater untruthfulness. As Aquinas puts it: "Just as he who turns his bodily eye from the Sun is plunged in bodily darkness, so he who turns from God is involved in spiritual darkness."

But the heathens, in their folly, thought themselves wise, and put mere idol-images in the place of the immortal God. And then they did not even content themselves with idol-images in human form, but fashioned their deities in all sorts of brute-animal shapes (22-23).

Knowledge of God is attainable, then, through the revelation of Himself which He has given in nature. Though God cannot be seen immediately with the bodily eye,¹ He can be discerned, at least partially, by the normal reflective mind in the things of creation. He can be perceived as the eternal, omnipotent, and divine Creator. But the heathen world of Paul's time had failed to recognise its obligation to honour, and to give thanks to the Deity whom nature revealed. The mind of heathenism was full of futile thoughts, and it had become enveloped in intellectual and moral darkness—"walking in the folly of their mind, with their reason obscured, alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that was in them, and through the insensibility of their hearts" (Eph. iv. 17). Blinded to their own ignorance they regarded themselves as the genuinely wise ones, and in their profound futility, they actually gave to idols representing not merely men, but all kinds of animals, the honour which was due to the eternal God.

Paul's treatment of heathen worship is strongly reminiscent of Wisdom xii-xv. Compare, especially, Wisd. xiii. 1-5; 8-10: "Foolish by nature were all men on whom ignorance of God lay as a burden, who were not able from visible good things to recognise Him that is, nor, while contemplating the works, recognise the Artificer; but took fire, or wind, or the swift air, or the circling stars, or the mighty ocean, or the lights of heaven for world-ruling gods. Charmed by the beauty of those things they conjectured divinities therein—

¹ *Intellectu cognosci potest Deus, non sensu vel imaginatione quæ corporalia non transcendunt: Deus autem spiritus est.* Aquinas.

though they ought to have known how much more excellent is the Lord of those things, for it was the Author of Beauty itself that fashioned them.

If they were astonished at the strength and might of those things, they ought to have realised therefrom how much mightier is their Creator. For from the greatness and beauty of creatures man forms correspondingly the image of their Creator.

But, on the other hand, they are inexcusable, for if they had capacity to know so much that they could investigate the world, how was it that they did not sooner discover the Lord of these things? Miserable were they, and in dead things they set their hopes who called the works of men's hands gods—gold, silver, art-products, and animal forms, or a useless stone, the work of some ancient hand."

The whole treatment of heathen worship in Wisdom should be compared with the present context of Romans. There, as here, moral depravity is traced back to ignorance of God. "The worship of unnameable idols is the beginning, cause, and end of every evil," says Wisd. xiv. 27. In Wisdom, as here, the special enormity of representing the Deity in the form of beasts, and birds, and reptiles is emphasised (Wisd. xv. 16-19). Psalm passages (like Ps. cvi. 20) have also influenced Paul's treatment here.¹ In the ancient heathen world practically every species of animal-form was used to represent the Deity. In no place were theriomorphic divinities so familiar as in Ancient Egypt, and it is natural that the Book of Wisdom should select for special criticism this peculiarly outstanding aspect of Egyptian idolatry. If it was heinous to worship a divinity who could be shown forth in human lineaments, it was much more heinous to represent God by abhorrent bestial forms.

In spite of the degradation—intellectual and moral—to which their false attitude to God has reduced the heathen, Paul does not imply that it has become impossible for the Gentiles generally to see God as Creator in the world of experience.² If the Gentiles are blind to God, it is because they have blinded themselves.

Δοξάζειν and εὐχαριστεῖν (v. 21) indicate the essential features of that latreutic worship of God which the Gentiles

¹ Cf. Is. xl, xli, xliv, xlv.

² It was a commonplace of the Stoic philosophy of Paul's day that God could be discerned in the works of creation, and Monotheism was widely taught in the philosophical schools of the New Testament period. Cf. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 24-30; Kulmann, *Theologia Naturalis bei Philon und bei Paulus. Neutestamentliche Forschungen* i. 7, pp. 65 ff.

have refused to give Him. It is possible to take διότι, as immediately connected either with v. 20b or with v. 19. If it is connected with v. 19, v. 21 may be regarded as explaining the guilt and heinousness of idolatry.

Ἐματαιώθησαν, etc.: either (a) they turned in their thoughts from God and concentrated on "foolish" things, or (b) in their thinking they reached foolish notions of God and divine worship, or (c) they gave themselves up in their thoughts to worthless idols; idols were vain things (μάταια), and to such vain things the heathens gave their thoughts and worship.¹ In favour of (c) is the designation of false gods in Scripture as τὰ μάταια (cf. 2 K. xvii. 15; Am. ii. 4), and the use of ματαιοῦσθαι in the LXX in the meaning, "give oneself up to idolatry" (Jer. ii. 5).

Their heart (= their reason) is ἀσύνητος because it has turned away from God, the worship of Whom is "the chiefest wisdom": ἀσύνητος may be here used proleptically, as Aquinas says: *Per hoc quod obscuratum est, factum est cor eorum insipiens*. The darkening of the heart has both an intellectual and a moral reference: it is a "darkening" of the will as well as of the mind. "If the light that is within thee is darkness, how great is the darkness!" (Matth. vi. 23). In Paul's eyes conversion from heathenism to Christianity was a coming forth from intellectual and moral darkness into the bright day of clear knowledge and singleness of mind. Compare Eph. iv. 17, 18: καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοῦς αὐτῶν ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ ὄντες; v. 8: ἦτε γὰρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ; v. 14: ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφανῶσαι σοι ὁ Χριστός. In Col. i. 13, Paul speaks of the rescue of Christians "from the power of darkness."²

22. The folly of the heathens regards itself as wisdom. They boast of their philosophy (φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοί), but in regard to the worship of God, they are patently fools.³ Paul's words here are an attack on such pretence of higher *Gnosis* as he had met with at Athens and elsewhere. There is a reminiscence here of the beginnings of the Corinthian mission when Paul turned from the precious philosophy of

¹ Wisdom calls those who are ignorant of God μάταιοι φύσει (Wisd. xiii. 1), and speaks (xi. 15; xvi. 1) of the sending of a multitude of "unreasonable beasts" as vengeance upon idolaters: ἀντὶ λογισμῶν ἀσυνέτων ἀδικίας αὐτῶν, ἐν οἷς πλανηθέντες ἐθρήσκουν ἄλογα ἔρπετα καὶ κνώδαλα ἐπτελῇ (Wisd. xi. 15).

² Cf. Eph. ii. 11-12, for Paul's notion of the most fundamental disabilities of heathenism.

³ Cf. Ps. xiii. 1, and Ps. lii: "The fool says to himself: There is no God!" Isaiah denounces also those who are "wise in their own eyes": cf. v. 21; xxviii. 9 f; xxix. 14.

the Athenian dilettanti to the "Folly" of the Cross (1 Cor. ii).

The passive ἐμωράνθησαν may suggest the endurance of a punishment well deserved.

23. Καὶ ἡλλαξαν, etc. : καὶ connects epexegetically with v. 22. Paul here uses Ps. cv. 20 and Jer. ii. 11 (LXX) to characterise the folly and the injustice of idolatry. In their degradation the Gentiles come at last to worship images representing created things (Cf. the Wisdom passages referred to above).

Ὁμοίωμα εἰκόνος may mean "a likeness which is an idol" (εἰκών, often = "idol" in the New Testament; cf. Apoc. xiii. 14 f; xiv. 9, 11; xv. 2, etc.); in this new εἰκόνος is a genitive of quality, marking off the special kind of likeness meant—an idol-image. The sense is that they exchanged the glory of God for a likeness which was an idol. The Psalmist says of the idolatrous Israelites: "They exchanged their glory for the image of a grass-eating ox" (cv. 20).¹

Paul probably does not wish to assert that the heathen actually worshipped the idols themselves as such; had he wished to state that expressly, he would not have said ἐν ὁμοιώματι (cf. v. 25 below, and 1 Cor. viii. 5). Since, however, the divinities supposed to dwell in the idols, or to be represented by them, were really nothing, heathen worship was, in fact, a worship of the mere idols. This thought seems to underlie the Vulgate rendering, *in similitudinem imaginis*, as if the meaning were, partly, "the semblance of a likeness." There is in Paul's mind here also the thought of the absurdity of supposing that God could be like images fashioned by men. His general attitude to idolatry is similar to that of the Psalmist and the Prophets.

The passage vv. 19-23 may be regarded as a Scripture testimony for the doctrine that heathen idolatry was a gradual and culpable falling away from a primitive Monotheism.

(2) *Heathen Immorality.* I, 24-32

In this passage Paul shows that the moral degradation of heathenism, particularly in regard to sexual matters, is largely a result of heathen idolatry. The degradation follows from the awakening of evil tendencies in men when God's special protection is withdrawn. The violation of the sixth commandment appears as a result of the disregard of the first (cf. Wisd. xiv. 22-31).

¹ Cf. Deut. iv. 16-18.

24. Διὸ παρέδωκεν, etc.: the διὸ implies that the situation here described is a due requital for heathen dishonouring of God. The lusts of the heathen developed as their knowledge of God diminished, and their fear of God grew less.

Παρέδωκε is repeated three times—here, in v. 26, and in v. 28—three stages of moral declension being thus indicated:

- (a) impurity that dishonours the body;
- (b) unnatural vice;
- (c) perversion of the moral sense.¹

Παρέδωκε implies primarily the withdrawal of God's protecting grace; as Aquinas puts it: *Tradidit non quidem impellendo in malum, sed deserendo*. God does not, then, deliver men over directly to uncleanness—but *inquantum juste subtrahit gratiam per quam homines continebantur ne peccarent* (Cf. Aquinas, *Sum. Theol.* ii, Q. i, 79, a. 3). Thus, as Aquinas also points out, the first sin (against the First Commandment) becomes a cause (if a sin can at all be spoken of as a cause), of the second (against the sixth), and the second is a punishment of the first. But there is question throughout not so much of God's direct intervention, as of the more or less inevitable working out of moral forces.

Paul implies here, generally, that the chief Gentile sin was pride of mind and will. Though the heathen saw God in things—"in the work of His hands"—they refused to worship Him. The chastisement of their pride was idolatry, which led to impurity. This, in turn, led to complete perversion of the moral sense and religious indifference, and there finally resulted a multitude of all kinds of sins—a flood-tide of iniquity.

¹ Klostermann in an article in ZNW, 1933, 1 ff (*Die adäquate Vergeltung in Rm. i. 23-31*), seeks to show that, in this passage, we have not a description of three descending stages of moral degradation, but rather a threefold illustration of the teaching contained in Wisdom xi. 16, that a man is punished by that through which he sins:

- (a) Because, οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν, etc., God gave them up to an ἀδόκιμον νοῦν (v. 28).
- (b) μετήλλαξαν, the truth of God: hence μετήλλαξαν, the natural usage (25-26).
- (c) They exchanged the *glory* of God for idols, and so their own bodies were dishonoured (ἀτιμάζεσθαι, v. 22 f.).

Klostermann thinks that there is here no climax in the proper sense, but that in each case the same sin of turning aside in error from the true God is described from a special angle, and the divine reaction along the lines of Wisdom xi. 16 is depicted as an "equivalent retribution": (a) Because by their superstition men withdrew from God His glory, God gave them up to self-defiling immorality. (b) Because men exchanged God for false gods "equivalent retribution" required that men should exchange the natural use, for the perversion of nature. (c) Because men set no value on the possession of religious knowledge they were given up to a mentality blind to ethical values.

In the whole passage Klostermann sees the "pathos of the preacher" rather than the reflection of the philosophical student of history!

Ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις does not mean "by their desires"; it describes the state in which the heathens were as a result of turning away from God to creatures—caught in their lusts. It is not said that God gave them up to lusts—but that He gave them up, enmeshed as they were, in their lusts. If Paul wished to say that God gave the heathen, as the Vulgate puts it, *in desideria cordis eorum*, he would have used either εἰς or a dative without a preposition (*cf.* Eph. iv. 19). It was to ἀκαθαρσία that God gave up the heathen; they were already ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. The Vulgate treats ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις as if it were in apposition to εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν. Ἐἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι: the genitive of the infinitive may express a purpose ("so that their bodies might be dishonoured"), or a result (so that their bodies were dishonoured); or it may be explanatory (ἀκαθαρσία, which is a "dishonouring of the body"); ἀκαθαρσία is sexual impurity, and, in particular, unnatural vice.

Ἐν αὐτοῖς may mean that the dishonouring took place in their own bodies (in their own persons), or it is equivalent to ἐν ἀλλήλοις ("mutually"). It is not necessary to take ἀτιμάζεσθαι as a passive.

25. "Οἱτινες, etc. = "for they were such as (*quippe qui*) exchanged the truth of God for a false God." The "truth of God"—the truth which is God (the true nature of God), *i.e.*, the true God. In opposition to the true God the ψεῦδος must = false god. The truth of God, then, is not the truth revealed by God, nor the true knowledge of God, nor the loyal and faithful God, but simply the ἀληθὴς θεός—God in His true, divine, being. ψεῦδος = ἡρῶν, lying idols, which are really nothing (*Cf.* Gal. iv. 8; Is. xlv. 20; Jer. xiii. 25; xvi. 19). WW. read *in mendacio*.

Ἐσεβάσθησαν and ἐλάτρευσαν express respectively internal veneration of God and the external manifestation thereof in cult: σεβάζεσθαι (which is for σέβεσθαι) is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament.

Τῇ κτίσει includes every created thing that was an object of worship: the "creature" and the "Creator" correspond to the lie and the truth of the preceding clause.

Παρά τὸν κτίσαντα = instead of (the *potius quam* of the Vulgate) the Creator: the creature was worshipped to the disregard of God.

The reference to a dishonouring of God calls forth, as counterbalancing "euphemism," the "blessing"—a blessing which came readily to Jewish lips. God is not really affected adversely by heathen contempt—for He is "blessed forever"; but Paul feels bound to make a protest of blessing against

Pagan dishonouring of God. Note a similar insertion of a doxology in ix. 5 and 2 Cor. xi. 31.¹

26-27. Διὰ τοῦτο παρέδωκεν, etc.: Paul returns here to the question of unnatural lust. God's anger is seen in the moral corruption of the heathen as described in verses 26-32. πάθη ἀτιμίας = "dishonouring passions." Even the Pagans themselves regarded the vices here discussed as unnatural.²

Paul first describes the unnatural vices of women—the so-called "Lesbian" or "Sapphic" vices. As women are naturally more modest than men, this kind of vice is particularly heinous, and is, therefore, put here in the first place.

Χρῆσις is often used of sexual intercourse; the φυσικὴ χρῆσις is the natural intercourse of male and female: ἡ παρὰ φύσιν χρῆσις is unnatural or homosexual intercourse. The terms θήλειαι and ἄρσενες are used because there is question here of sexual matters only. Though Paul is speaking for the moment of the heathen, he does not insinuate that these vices were practised by the heathens only.

Ἐξεκάυθησαν is a *hapax legomenon*; τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην = "the already mentioned infamy," not, "the well-known infamy."

Καὶ τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν ἣν ἔδει [—add αὐτοῦς ἀπολαμβάνειν]—the wage (requital) which they deserved to receive for their error, they receive by dishonouring their own bodies. It is probable that there is here a reference to disease, bodily decay, madness, etc.—which might result from unnatural vice.

Their πλάνη is their error in regard to God. For the dishonour done to God by their turning to idols they receive due recompense in themselves (ἐν ἑαυτοῖς: cf. ἐν αὐτοῖς, v. 24), through the corruption and decay of their own bodies. As in Wisdom xiv. 12, 23-29, so here, rejection of the truth concerning God is the cause of the moral misery of the heathen.

28-30. In verses 28-30 the manifestation of God's wrath against the heathen is described in detail. For their culpable error in things religious there comes upon them a flood of vices and sins which poison and undermine the whole social system.

Οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει—they did not think it worth while to hold fast to the true knowledge of God, and to conform their conduct thereto.³ Some commentators explain the phrase as meaning that the heathen

¹ Cf. Bousset, *Judentum*, 2nd Ed. 360.

² Cf. Wetstein, ii, p. 24 f.

³ For ἔδοκίμασαν, cf. 1 Thess. ii. 4; 1 Cor. xvi. 3; 2 Cor. viii. 22.

did not try to pass from the γνώσις of God made accessible by nature, to a deeper and fuller knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις) such as could be attained by the practice of divine worship. This failure to aim at a deeper knowledge of God would imply an element of contempt for God, and, for this, God gave the heathen up εἰς ἄδόκιμον νοῦν—a counterfeit or worthless mind. The term ἄδόκιμος (—"counterfeit," "unable to stand the test") was originally used of money: later it came to mean, in general, "worthless," "useless." There is here a play on words in ἐδοκίμασαν and ἄδόκιμον νοῦν. The "worthless" mind is not a mind completely ignorant of moral distinctions: it is a mind that habitually misjudges, or that judges in a morally depraved fashion. It implies a disposition for evil-doing even against the warnings of conscience—a reprobate mind.

Ποιεῖν is either expegetive or expressive of result ("so that they did"): τὰ μὴ κατῆκοντα is hardly used in the Stoic technical sense here. The opposite of τὸ κατῆκον is usually τὸ παρὰ τὸ κατῆκον: but τὸ μὴ κατῆκον occurs also.¹

Possibly the general sense here is that the "worthless" reason "accepts what ought to be rejected, and reprobates what ought to be chosen" (Aquinas): it is, as it were, the practical reason negating itself.

- 29-31. Here we have a catalogue of heathen vices: it contains twenty-one sins, the enumeration of which follows no clearly discernible system. Sometimes sins objectively associated are brought together; but sometimes the grouping seems to be determined solely by similarity of name.

The catalogue falls into four groups.

(a) The first group is introduced by πεπληρωμένους,² which is to be construed with ποιεῖν (and not, as the Vulgate suggests, with παρέδωκε): that term implies that the sinners of this group are not occasional offenders merely, but that they are saturated with iniquity. There are four sins in this group:

- (1) "All injustice": for Aquinas—a man "filled with all injustice" is *ille cuius affectus est totaliter ad peccandum dispositus*. The "injustice" is apparently a general idea which includes the sins that follow as species.

¹ Cf. Eph. v. 4: & οὐκ ἀνῆκεν: cf. Col. iii. 18. τὸ ἀνῆκον = what is due, or obligatory.

² The construction of πεπ. with a dative, instead of a genitive, Pallis explains as a Latinism: cf. Eph. v. 18; Luke ii. 46.

(2) *πονηρία* = malignity. In some MSS. *πορνεία* appears here ; but it is a scribal error. Sexual excesses have been dealt with in the preceding verses. The Vulgate includes *fornicatio* (*πορνεία*).

(3) *κακία* = malice.

(4) *πλεονεξία* = avarice at the expense of one's neighbour, unscrupulous self-aggrandisement, ruthless self-seeking (not "lust"—as Moffatt renders): cf. 1 Cor. v. 10; Eph. iv. 19.

The order of (2), (3), (4) varies greatly in the MSS.: all the MSS. begin with (1); several add *πορνεία*. Taking *πονηρία*, *κακία*, and *πλεονεξία* as 1, 2, 3 respectively, we find the following MS. variations in the order:

1.	3.	2.
2.	1.	3.
2.	3.	1.

The most usual order in the West is 2, 1, 3, or 2, 3, 1. The arrangements, 1, 3, 2 and 1, 2, 3 are common in Syria: 1, 3, 2 is the order of the Byzantine *κοινή*. Lietzmann adopts the order 1, 3, 2, because it is widely disseminated, and has the support of B: *πορνεία* looks like a Scribal correction of *πονηρία*.

(b) *Second Group.*

A second group introduced by *μεστούς* includes five vices, all of which seem to be forms of hatred or ill-will towards the brethren:

(1) *φθόνου* = jealousy.

(2) *φόνου* = murder.

These are associated partly because of similarity of name, and partly because of real connection: cf. 1 John iii. 12, for a prominent illustration of that connection:

(3) *ἔριδος* = quarrelsomeness: it goes with *φθόνος*: cf. Phil. i. 15; 1 Tim. vi. 4.

(4) *δόλου* = treachery: cf. Acts. xiii. 10; 2 Cor. xii. 16.

(5) *κακοηθείας* = evil-mindedness (a *hapax legomenon*): Vulgate renders *malignitas*.

(c) *Third Group.*

This group contains seven terms, which seem to refer chiefly to heathen pride towards God and fellow-man:

(1) *ψιθυριστάς* = gossips, "whisperers," secret calumniators.

- (2) καταλάλους = slanderers : cf. Wisd. i. 11.

These two classes go well with the members of Group (b).

- (3) θεοστυγείς : this term may have an active sense, "God-hating," or passive, "God-abhorred." Some older commentators regard the active meaning as the more likely in the context (so Theodoret). Vulgate has *Deo odibiles*. Lietzmann maintains that the passive sense is the only one possible here. Yet, in a list of evil qualities of men, "God-hating" seems to be more in place than "God-abhorred." The three next following classes, characterised, as they are, by pride and hatred of God, would naturally be associated with those who hate God.
- (4) ὑβριστάς = insolent, overbearing.
- (5) ὑπερηφάνους = haughty, arrogant.
- (6) ἀλαζόνες = "boasters."
- (7) ἐφευρετὰς κακῶν = devisers of evil. Paul may have here in view the inventiveness of the heathen in devising new forms of vice : but the epithet may be meant for those who devise evil against their fellows. Pallis conjectures κενῶν for κακῶν.

(d) *Fourth Group.*

In this group there are five terms compounded of α—privative, which denote the absence of all natural feeling of piety, love, honour and compassion, respectively. The vices here enumerated cut at the roots of all social life :

- (1) γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς : this, for Paul, was a special token of moral degeneracy : cf. 2 Tim. iii. 2.
- (2) ἀσυνέτους = "not amenable to reason" (Pallis) : the foolish in thought and action ; those who have lost all genuine understanding of religious matters.
- (3) ἀσυνθέτους = a *hapax legomenon* : it means disloyal to compacts, treacherous, or irreconcilable, obstinate in maintaining feuds. The Vulgate renders "incompositos" as if the word meant "rough," "uncouth," "untamed." It is grouped closely with ἀσυνέτους on account of similarity of sound.
- (4) ἀστόργους = without affection in family life. Many MSS. add here ἀσπόνδους (Vulgate, *absque fœdere*). The interpolation may be due to the influence of 2 Tim. iii. 3. Pallis regards it as possibly a gloss on ἀσυνθέτους.

- (5) ἀνελεήμονος: this word implies harshness towards slaves, and callous cruelty—such, for instance, as made the heathens take pleasure in gladiatorial combats.

It is disputed whether in this and in other lists of sins found in the Pauline writings (Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Cor. v. 10-11; vi. 9-10; 2 Cor. xii. 20-21; Gal. v. 19-21; Eph. iv. 31; v. 3-4; Col. iii. 5-8; 1 Tim. i. 9-10; 2 Tim. iii. 2-5). Paul is summarising his own experience, or borrowing either from Old Testament catalogues of sins (cf. Exod. xx. 21-xxiii. 19; xxxiii. 14-26; Lev. xix; Deut. xxvii. 15-26; Hos. iv. 1 f; cf. also Wisdom of Solomon, xii. 3 ff; xiv. 22 ff; 4 Maccab. i-iii), or from such heathen (particularly Stoic) lists of sins as we find in Diogenes Laertes, vii. 110-114 (cf. Cicero, *Tusculan.* iv. 5, 9-10, 24).

The Old Testament lists are very different from the Pauline, and probably have no immediate influence on the latter. While it is thinkable that Paul was familiar with Stoic lists of vices, since they were known to Hellenistic Judaism, it is not possible to show that his lists of sins are dependent on Stoic, or other heathen lists.¹

32. Ὅτινες = "yet they are such as." This is the worst aspect of heathen corruption. The heathen know well (ἐπιγινόντες) the divine decree against those who commit the sins here enumerated (especially those named in vv. 24-27)—that, namely, they are deserving of death; and yet they go on committing them. This attitude throws light on the ἀδόκιμος νοῦς of v. 28.

The ὅτι clause gives the content of the δικαίωμα (statute, ordinance, decree). The heathen could know this decree, because it was written on their hearts and testified to by their conscience. Death is mentioned because it was the most dread penalty of all. The death in question is probably spiritual death (eternal damnation): the heathen generally held the view that sin was punished in the world beyond the grave.

Ὅου μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ, etc. Not merely do the heathen commit the sins which will bring them death; they even applaud the vicious conduct of others. This applauding Paul regards as a mark of even deeper corruption than the

¹ The derivation of the Pauline lists of sins is fully discussed in Francke, *Das Woher der neutestamentlichen Lastertafeln*, Leipzig, 1930. Lietzmann in his Commentary gives a fairly full account of the heathen and other parallels to the Pauline lists; he is inclined to admit the presence of Stoic influence in the Pauline catalogues of vices. Lagrange insists on the important new points of view suggested by Paul's catalogues, in a valuable summary of the teaching on the relation between religious error and corruption of morals contained in Rom. i. 24-32.

actual commission (ποιεῖν) of the crimes in question : it denotes a complete break-down of decent public opinion and the triumph of the ἀδόκιμος νοῦς.

B has the reading, οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιοῦντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦντες τοῖς πράσσουσιν : the exclusion of the finite verb in this reading Lietzmann regards as a very ancient mistake (not due to any Scribe of B). The Clementine Vulgate, *et non solum qui ea faciunt, sed etiam qui consentiunt facientibus* is corrected by WW into *non solum ea faciunt sed et consentiunt facientibus*. The reading with *qui* is due perhaps to an effort to avoid the somewhat difficult climax of the Greek text.¹

The Old Latin rendering is : *Qui cum justitiam Dei cognovissent, non intellexerunt, quoniam qui talia agunt, digni sunt morte ; et non solum qui ea faciunt, sed et qui consentiunt facientibus*.

Both in the Vulgate and the Old Latin *justitia* renders δικαιοσύνη, and both versions miss the point of the clause, *quoniam qui talia agunt, digni sunt morte*, and both insert *non intellexerunt*. Certain Greek MSS. (DEG) under the influence of the Latin, have a clause corresponding to *non intellexerunt* (οὐκ ἐνόησαν—D ; οὐκ ἔγνωσαν—G).

The gloomy picture of heathen society which Paul paints in the present context can be shown to be exact by what is known otherwise of the heathen world of Paul's time. Paul knew, of course, that heathenism was not altogether lacking in fine moral personalities, or in lofty ethical conceptions : but he is concerned here to show the inevitable effects on society generally of false and perverted views on the nature of God ; and the existence of a small number of exceptions—however outstanding—to the conclusions at which he arrives, in no way affects the value of his argument.

(b) CORRUPTION OF THE JEWISH WORLD. II, 1—III, 20

Paul now turns to the Jews. They are in no less sore need of salvation than the Gentiles, for they are involved in the same sins as the heathen world, and are liable, therefore, to the same judgment as the Gentiles. But the Jews labour under the absurd delusion that, as children of Abraham, they are secure from God's wrath.

Paul addresses the Jews as if they were finding fault with leniency on his part towards the heathen. He points out that the Jew, as such, has no right to judge others, and that

¹ See a discussion on the Latin rendering in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1894, p. 655.

the privileges of the Jews cannot exempt them from the obligations and the sanctions of the moral law. He writes throughout as if he were actually speaking to an audience—so that we have here a specimen of the *diatribe* of the period. As in the preceding section, Paul depicts the heathen world as he knows it, so here we have, in all probability, a description of the actual Judaism of Paul's time.

In this section the following ideas are put forward :

(1) It is futile for the Jews, in view of their own sinfulness, to judge others (ii. 1-4).

(2) In the end no one—whether Jew or Gentile—will escape the Divine judgment ; each will be judged according to his works (ii. 5-11).

(3) Neither the possession, nor the non-possession of the Mosaic Law will save a man from the anger of God. It is not *having* a law that counts, but *keeping* it. The heathen have their Law as well as the Jews, and both will be judged by God according to the manner in which they have observed the commands of their respective codes (ii. 12-16).

(4) The Jews have the Mosaic Law, and are thus in a privileged position to know exactly the Divine will ; yet, in spite of thus knowing far better than others what is right, they are constant offenders against the Law (ii. 17-24).

(5) Circumcision will not avail to protect sinful Jews from the anger of God. It is not external circumcision but the circumcision that is inward—the circumcision of the heart—that avails before God (ii. 25-29).

(6) Even their privilege of being custodians of the Oracles of God will not save the Jews. There is no genuine excuse whatsoever for Jewish disloyalty to God (iii. 1-8).

(7) In a concluding section Paul develops at length the Scriptural proof of Jewish sinfulness. It is to the Jews, he assumes, that Scriptural utterances about men's sinfulness immediately refer (iii. 9-20).

(1) *Folly of the Jews in Judging Others.* II, 1-4

1. The heathens have sinned through failing to follow the Truth as they saw it. Their Jewish critics have fuller knowledge than the Gentiles, and are, therefore, more guilty than the Gentiles, when they sin.

The unexpected introduction of a person addressed is a feature of the Stoic *Diatribe*. The person here addressed is obviously a Jew ; in v. 17 below the Jew is directly addressed as such.

Διό connects with i. 32 : the Gentiles are without excuse

for their immorality: hence their more fully instructed Jewish critics, whose deeds are no less sinful than those of the heathen whom they condemn, are still more inexcusable; κρίνειν seems to mean here "condemn" (κατακρίνειν).

Ἐν ᾧ = either "thereby that" (= ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι) or "that in which" (= ἐν τούτῳ ἐν ᾧ); τὰ αὐτά = not precisely "the same things," but rather, "similar things."

As each one will be judged by his deeds, actual performance is more important than criticism.

2. "Οἶδμεν: every man, as such, knows this; it needs no proof. Read δέ, not γάρ. God judges rigidly according to fact, and without trace of partiality ("according to truth")—*secundum merita operum absque respectu personarum* (Estius). The "truth" is "rei veritas"—reality or fact, and with God there is no προσωποληψία (v. 11 below. Cf. Eph. vi. 9). Hence it is useless for Israel to expect special consideration or favour from God in the Judgment.
3. Paul here meets the Jewish delusion that the Jews, as children of Abraham and custodians of God's Oracles, are safe from the wrath of God (Cf. Matth. iii. 7-9; Luke iii. 8; Cf. also Justin, *Trypho*, 126): λογίζεσθαι has here the sense, "imagine," "fancy."

The delusion in question was a very real obstacle to the acceptance of Christianity by the Jewish people: it prevented them from realising their need of Salvation.

4. Here another kind of folly is attacked—overweening confidence in that goodness, patience, and long-suffering which God has shown to Israel. Not realising that the Divine graciousness shown in forbearance aims merely at giving the sinner time for repentance (cf. Wisd. xi. 23-24), the Jews have taken it as a reason for continuing in sin. Because the ὁργή θεοῦ had not been revealed against them, the Jews were led, in a sense, to despise (καταφρονεῖς) the goodness of God, or, at least, to infer that God would save them in spite of their sins.

There is here an echo of Wisd. xv. 1-2 (cf. Eccli. v. 4 and Eccle. viii. 11), and a further indication, therefore, that the person addressed in v. 1 represents the Jewish people. To the Jews more than to any other people the goodness, patience, and long suffering of God had been shown forth.

Πλούτου: The idea of overflowing abundance and wealth is constantly associated with the goodness and grace of God (cf. ix. 23; xi. 33; Eph. i. 7, etc., etc.). Ἀνοχή is the patience with which God endures the sinner: μακροθυμία is the long suffering with which God defers punishment in order to effect moral improvement in the sinner. The use of the

various terms, "goodness," "forbearance," "long-suffering," serves to emphasise the abundance and intensity of God's goodness towards sinners (*Cf.* *Wisd.* xv ; xi. 23 ; xii. 10, 18-22).

Ἀγνοῶν: The sinner's neglect and contempt of God's goodness is due to an unintelligible, yet culpable and punishable, ignorance. He fails to see how true it is: *Misericordia Dei quia non sumus consumpti*. But the goodness of God is in no mere expression of His favour towards His own people: it is intended to lead them to repentance (*Cf.* *Wisd.* xi. 23-24). Neglect of the season of grace only increases the guilt of the sinner. This verse shows how false is the theory of absolute reprobation.

(2) *God's ineluctable Judgment.* II, 5-11

5. Through his impenitence, and in proportion to it, the sinner stores up for himself an ever-increasing anger. That anger will flare forth on the day of God's Judgment—i.e., at the General Judgment. God will then give sentence on each one according to his works.

The "obduracy" is the obstinacy of the mind that will not be influenced, and of the will that cannot be moved. There is a sort of irony in *θησαυρίζεις* (*cf.* *Jas.* v. 3): the sinner despises the wealth of God's goodness, but stores up for himself God's wrath. Chrysostom notes that the sinner, not God, stores up the wrath.¹

Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς: The sinner stores up wrath so that a storm of anger is ready to burst forth on the day of wrath; ἐν is used, rather than εἰς, because Paul is thinking of the moment in which the judgment of wrath will be made known (*Cf.* *Jas.* v. 3). The "Day of Wrath" is the Old Testament "Day of Yahweh," which "comes, ruthless with fury and burning anger" (*Is.* xiii. 9 ; *cf.* *Ezech.* xxii. 24 ; *Joel* ii. 1, etc.)—the day on which God will judge the wicked. It is further called here the "Day of the manifestation of the just judging of God"—the Day, that is, on which God's vindictive justice will be shown forth to all, and all men will recognise its fairness (*Cf.* *2 Thess.* i. 5). The Old Testament Prophets make it clear that the Day of Yahweh will be a day of wrath for Jews as well as Gentiles. Note that δίκαιοκρίσις is "just judging," rather than "just judgment." The reference here is not to the Fall of Jerusalem, nor to the dispersal of the Jewish people as a punishment for their sins: Paul is speaking eschatologically.

¹ *Cf.* *Eph.* vi. 8 ; *2 Cor.* v. 10 ; *Matth.* xvi. 27, etc. God does not fail to give requital.

6. Ὅς ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ is borrowed from Ps. lxi. 13 (*Cf.* Prov. xxiv. 12 ; Eccli. xxxii. 24). It is a perfectly clear statement that mere faith is not sufficient for salvation. Paul nowhere teaches that faith alone is sufficient for salvation. His plain teaching is that faith is an indispensable condition for the attainment of justification, and that a life according to faith (*i.e.*, a life in which the commandments are observed, a life of "good works") is necessary for gaining eternal life. If it was necessary for the Jew to live up to his faith, the same must hold for the Christian, and the verses that follow make this perfectly clear. The judgment according to works implies the utter inadequacy of the Lutheran theory.

7. The Day of Judgment will divide men into two groups : (a) those who by perseverance in good works have striven after "glory" and "honour," and "immortality" ; (b) men of intrigue and self-seeking who oppose truth and obey falsehood. To (a) will be given eternal life ; to (b) wrath and indignation.

In the clause ὑπομονὴ ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ (patient and persevering performance of good work), "good work" is to be taken collectively : it means the supernatural good works that spring from "faith energising through charity" (Gal. v. 6). "Glory" and "honour" are supernatural blessings—aspects of eternal life with God.¹ The men of group (a) will receive honour from God and His Saints and a blessed immortality. For the immortality here promised, *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 42-44 (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 25) ; Wisd. iii. 4 ; xv. 3. In the genuine ἀφθαρσία the body also will share. The accusative, ζωὴν αἰώνιον depends on ἀποδώσει ; δόξαν, τιμὴν, and ἀφθαρσίαν are governed by ζητοῦσιν.

WW read in the Vulgate *his quidem*.

8. Τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας (add, for the sense, οὓσιν) ; WW read, *his qui ex contentione*. It is probable that ἐριθεία is derived from ἐριθός—a hired labourer (ἐριθεύειν—ἐριθεύεσθαι = to work for hire). If this derivation is correct, ἐριθεία implies self-seeking. The word is used in Aristotle, *Politics*, v. 3 (μεταβάλλουσι δ' αἱ πολιτεῖαι ἀνευ στάσεως διὰ τε τὰς ἐριθείας), of "canvassing" or seeking favour with political groups as opposed to revolutionary methods (quoted by Lietzmann). Lag. is inclined to regard ἐριθεία as a popular derivation from ἐρεθίζω (which sometimes appears in the LXX as a rendering of *marah*), and to explain it as = a spirit of revolt or indiscipline (—referring to

¹ For the "glory," *cf.* Matth. xiii. 43 ; Ps. cxlix. 5 ; for the "honour," *cf.* Apoc. v. 10 ; Wisd. v. 4.

Jewish revolts against Moses and the Prophets). Others derive it from ἐρις ("strife"), and this derivation is favoured by the Vulgate rendering *contentio*, and by the Peshitta with its 'asen' ("the contentious"). The Vulgate renders it *contentio* also in Phil. i. 16 f; ii. 3. The derivation from ἐρις is supported also by Chrysostom's rendering of the word—φιλονεικία.

It is well known that the spirit of contentiousness was a Jewish national failing, and that Jewish hostility to heathens was a serious difficulty in the development of the Early Church.¹

Ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ: The "Truth" here may be the truth of the Gospel: or it may have the wider sense of moral and religious truth generally, as made known by conscience, and revealed both by natural revelation, and by the preaching of the Gospel.

Ἀδικία here may be the rejection of the moral law generally—as "justice" may mean its fulfilment.

Note the nominatives ὀργή and θυμός: we have here, perhaps, not so much anacoluthon as *oratio variata*. Possibly the nominatives imply that the wicked procure anger and wrath for themselves, while God *gives* eternal life to the good.

9-10. Here Paul repeats solemnly all the foregoing teaching—inverting the order. These verses make it clear that κατὰ τὰ ἔργα refers both to Jews and heathens. Gutjahr insists that there is no reference in this context to Jewish and Gentile *Christians*, but only to Jews and heathens as such.

Aquinas explains θλίψις as *omne quod dolorem affert*; στενοχωρία is extreme and ineluctable trouble (= anguish).

"Every soul" = every individual: Hebrew, *kol nephesh*.

The Jews are named first as the chosen people; besides, as Aquinas says, *Judæis major pœna debebatur tanquam cognoscentibus Dei voluntatem per Legem*.

Note the contrast between κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ κακόν, and ἐργάζεσθαι τὸ ἀγαθόν. The stress is put on ἔργα; but it seems almost as if Paul implied that evil-doing by the wicked was more thoroughgoing than the doing of good by the virtuous.

"Peace" here replaces ἀφθαρσία (v. 7; cf. Wisd. iii. 3). The peace in question is the secure and peaceful possession of God's blessings.

11. The Judge will show no προσωποληψία to the Jews.² Insistence on God's impartiality was important for those

¹ In Phil. i. 17, οἱ ἐξ ἐπιθέως is used to designate false teachers—possibly Judaizers.

² Compare the emphasis on God's impartiality in Wisd. vi. 7-8.

who were accustomed to the corruption of public life in the East. The equality of Jews and Gentiles before God's tribunal was not an ideal that appealed to the Jews.

(3) *The Gentiles have a Law of their own.* II, 12-16

The Jews had good reason to be proud of their Law : but they were not the only people who had a Law.

12. The heathen are ἄνομοι only in the sense of not possessing the Mosaic Law : they have the natural law, and, just as the Jews will be judged by their observance of the Mosaic Law, the heathen will be judged according to the manner in which they have followed the natural law. Ἀνόμως cannot mean "apart from all law," since there would be no guilt apart from all law (iv. 15) : it must mean here "without the Mosaic Law." If the Gentiles have sinned without knowing the Mosaic Law, they will be condemned without reference to that Law. WW have *Sine lege et peribunt*.

Ἀπολοῦνται implies eternal destruction, as opposed to ζωὴ αἰώνιος (John iii. 15). The Jews will be judged according to their attitude to the Mosaic Law—διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται : the idea of condemnation is not excluded by κριθήσονται. Mere possession of the Mosaic Law will not, therefore, save the Jews in the Judgment : "destruction" may be their lot, as it may be the lot of the heathen.

13. It is not those who hear the Law read, nor experts in the Law, that will be declared just in the final Judgment (ἔσονται is to be understood with δίκαιοι). It is not enough for the Jews to possess the Law and to hear it read on the Sabbath : they must also put it in practice (*Cf.* Acts xv. 21 ; 2 Cor. iii. 14 f). SB quote sayings of like sentiment from the Rabbinical writings. In the older period the Rabbis taught almost unanimously that the study of the Law was less important than the practice of it. The prohibition of both the observance and the study of the Jewish Law in the reign of Hadrian led, however, definitely to the view that it was better to study the Law than to put it in practice.

Δικαιωθήσονται = will be declared just, or will be recognised as just, by the Judge : it is parallel to δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, so that it cannot mean the imparting of a hitherto non-existing justice. Those who come before the Judgment Throne cannot become just, or more just : hence, since the Judge is Truth itself, if those who come before His tribunal are declared just, they must be already just ; they must, that is, be already in the state of grace. The Gentiles may also be reckoned as ποιηταὶ νόμου in the sense of the context (*Cf.* Jas. iv. 11 ; i. 22).

It is not, of course, here implied that anyone can be justified by works of the Law alone.¹ Paul is not here concerned with the conditions or causes of justification in general, but only with the standards of Divine judgment.

14-15. These verses are a sort of parenthesis answering a question suggested to the Jewish mind by vv. 12-13: How can Gentiles, who are not "hearers of the Law," be "doers of the Law"?

The heathen have, in fact, a Law, since they actually do what the Mosaic Law prescribes—without knowing that Law². They fulfil the Law, *φύσει*—i.e., as instructed and impelled by their rational nature: *φύσει* does not mean, as Pelagius held, *natura sola sine gratia*, nor does it mean as Augustine, holding that the *ἔθνη* here are Gentile Christians, thought, *natura per gratiam reparata*.³

Paul means simply that the heathen, following the promptings of their rational nature, act according to the Law: he does not touch the question whether the heathen thus act of their own strength alone, or as aided by supernatural grace.

Chrysostom explains *φύσει* as "in virtue of their natural rational knowledge"; Ambrosiaster, as, *natura duce, naturaliter, per modum naturæ*.

Τὰ τοῦ νόμου = what the Law requires. Notice that we have *ἔθνη*, not *τὰ ἔθνη*: there is question only of occasional Gentiles. But since even occasional Gentiles would scarcely carry out all that the Mosaic Law requires, *τὰ τοῦ νόμου* must be limited to elements that are common to both the Mosaic Law and the natural law—to the essentials, that is, or primary obligations of the Law, for instance, the Decalogue. The natural practical reason would have knowledge of the primary duties of man towards God and his neighbour: *φύσει* does not exclude the help of grace; and, indeed, if the heathen can thus meritoriously fulfil the Law, both faith and grace would seem inferentially to be present.

Since the Gentiles do what is prescribed by the Mosaic Law, it is clear that they have a "Law," and, since they

¹ It might be pointed out, of course, that unflinching observance of the moral precepts of the Law would not be possible without grace, and that the complete observance of the Law would, therefore, postulate the presence of the conditions of justification laid down by St. Paul.

² WW read: *Naturaliter quæ legis sunt*.

³ Aquinas seems inclined to favour Augustine's view: yet he explains "*naturaliter*" as, *per legem naturalem ostendentem eis quid sit agendum secundum illud Ps. iv. 6: Quis ostendit nobis bona? Signatum est super nos lumen vultus tui, Domine.*

The *lumen vultus tui* is, for Aquinas, *lumen rationis naturalis in qua est imago Dei*. The absence of grace is not implied in the explanation of Aquinas.

have not received that Law as such from outside, they must have given it to themselves. It must be, therefore, written on their hearts.

- 15a. Οἵτινες = *quippe qui*. "Since they are such as": the reference is to the heathen who fulfil the Law.

The "work of the Law" = τὰ τοῦ νόμου of v. 14, and "the works of the Law" of iii. 20, 28: the meaning of such "work," or "works," is action corresponding to the requirements of the Law, or to the demands of the Law in general (in the limited sense, of course, explained in v. 14).

Ἐνδείκνυνται = show clearly, display obviously. Their fulfilment of the commands of the Mosaic Law which they do not know, shows clearly that they are a Law to themselves.

"Written on their hearts" suggests contrast with the stone tablets on which the Decalogue was written, and with the Synagogue rolls of the Torah (*Cf.* Jer. xxxi. 33; Prov. iii. 3; 2 Cor. iii. 3, is not a parallel to the present text).¹

- 15b. If the phenomena of the inner life of the heathen are studied, it will be still clearer that they are a law to themselves.

Evidence thereof, in the first place, is their conscience—God's incorruptible censor of moral action. In the next place, there is evidence thereof in their thoughts about the conduct of others. Their approval or censure in thought of the actions of others postulates in them a standard of criticism—i.e., a Law which determines the difference between good and evil: that is to say, the law by which they judge must be a law written in their hearts: they are, in other words, a law to themselves.

In this paraphrase of 15b συναρτυρούσης is taken as a predicate of both συνειδήσεως and λογισμῶν, and the participles κατηγορούντων and ἀπολογουμένων are connected attributively with λογισμῶν.²

That to which conscience on the one hand, and the accusing

¹Lietzmann gives a useful Excursus, in reference to vv. 14-16, on the Stoic teaching that moral action implies the following of laws implanted in men by nature, and that these laws have their origin in the Deity. This idea was developed by Hellenistic Judaism, for propaganda purposes, by the theory that the Mosaic Law was the most perfect formulation of the content of the naturally given "inner law," or moral code implanted in men's hearts by nature. Philo frequently insists on the agreements of the Mosaic Code with Natural Ethics, and maintains that the non-Jew should have little difficulty in observing the essentials of the Mosaic Law (See the references in Lietzmann).

It is important to note that Paul suggests a pleasanter picture of contemporary Heathenism in these verses than in chapter i. It is to be noted, too, that the "conscience" is not here depicted as a legislative faculty, but as a faculty of moral judgment. Even when the heathen is a law to himself, he does not make the law for himself: the law has come to him also ultimately from God.

² WW read: *Cogitationum accusantium aut etiam defendentium*.

and defending thoughts, on the other, testify, is the proof already given that the Gentiles are a law to themselves.

In this explanation μεταξύ ἀλλήλων can be rendered, "in (their) intercourse with one another." The ἢ καὶ insinuates that *excusing* is a much rarer attitude of the mind than condemning.

This is not the usual interpretation of the verse. It is more usual to take 15c as a detailed description of the working of conscience, and to refer μεταξύ ἀλλήλων, not to individuals in a group, or community, who have intercourse with one another, but to the "thoughts." In this view the "thoughts" would be reflex judgments of the individual about some point of conduct. These judgments are, then, μεταξύ ἀλλήλων = "among themselves"—i.e., apart from any outside norm, or externally imposed standard.

Yet it is difficult to see how the presence in an individual's mind of contending judgments about the moral quality of a particular action, can serve as a proof that the individual in question is a law to himself: it would rather show that he is a creature of caprice.

It is possible also to take 15b as containing two distinct clauses—συνμαρτυρούσης being construed with συνειδήσεως only, and τῶν λογισμῶν κατηγορούντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογουμένων forming a second distinct clause: the sense, in this view, would be: "Their conscience bearing witness [to the law written in their hearts]; and their thoughts, in their intercourse with one another, accusing or even defending [the conduct of their neighbours]"; the two genitive absolute clauses would show that the Gentiles have a moral standard by which they judge. The exercise of moral criticism in a heathen community might be taken as proving that such a community possessed a moral standard, or law. Such a law or standard, then, not having been received from outside, must come from their own reason—i.e., they are a law to themselves.¹

16. Having thus shown in vv. 14, 15 that the Gentiles also can be "doers of the Law," Paul now gives the conclusion suppressed in v. 13—viz., that the Gentiles also, as "doers of the Law," may be declared just in the Last Judgment.

All that lies between δικαιωθήσονται and ἐν ἡμέρᾳ is a parenthesis showing that the Gentiles have a Law as well as the Jews, and will be judged according to their observance

¹ Lietzmann discusses at length in his commentary the apparent points of agreement between Paul's doctrine of the Gentile as a law to himself, and the Stoic theory of morality.

of that Law.¹ The existence of the Law among the Gentiles is proved from the admitted existence among the heathen of the phenomena of conscience and moral criticism.

Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ: There are several readings:

(a) ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε.

(b) ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ.

(c) ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ.

Lietzmann regards (b) as, probably, original.

The future κρινεῖ should be read, as a parallel to δικαιοῦσονται. In vv. 14–15, Paul had spoken of conscience and heart, and conformity with a self-imposed standard: with these "hidden things," then, the judgment will deal. The judgment will take place according to Paul's teaching (i.e., his "Gospel"), for he has always taught that God will judge men's hearts (Cf. ch. xiv. 10–12; 1 Cor. iv. 4; 2 Cor. v. 10). If the heathen have observed the Law written in their hearts, they will be justified. The Judge at the Last Judgment will be Christ Jesus Himself (as is plainly set forth in the Gospels: Matth. xxv. 31–46; John v. 22; cf. Acts x. 42; xvii. 31; 2 Cor. v. 10, etc.).—διὰ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Jew and Gentile will appear before the same Divine tribunal. How foolish it is, then, to refuse to accept as Saviour Him who will be Lord of the Great Judgment!²

(4) *Jewish Violation of the Law.* II, 17–24

Paul has now shown that the Gentiles also have a Law according to which they will be judged. It is foolish then for the Jews to boast of their Law, if they do not observe it. And indeed their Law is more often broken than observed!

17–20. Here begins a long protasis (17–20) which has no proper apodosis. The privileged position of which the Jews boast is described rather ironically. The Jew had indeed good reason to boast of possessing the Mosaic Law. He could

¹ Moffatt in his Translation puts v. 16 immediately after v. 13. Dodd accepts this arrangement in his commentary.

² In connection with this Pauline teaching note the proposition condemned by Alexander VIII: *Pagani, Judæi, heretici, alique hujus generis nullum omnino accipiunt a Jesu Christo influxum: adeoque hinc recte inferes in illis esse voluntatem nudam et inermem sine omni gratia sufficiente* (See Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion*, No. 1295).

Note also the proposition of Quesnel condemned by Clement XI: *Extra ecclesiam nulla conceditur gratia.* D—B. 1379.

There is further to be noted the condemned proposition of Baius: *Cum Pelagio sentiunt, qui textum Apostoli ad Romanos, II: "Gentes quæ legem non habent naturaliter ea, quæ legis sunt, faciunt," de gentibus fidei gratiam non habentibus intelligunt.* D—B 1022.

boast of the institution of the Law and all that it implied—the special call of Israel, the Covenant, the glory of having God as Israel's King. He could, therefore, with reason, put his trust in, or, "lean upon" (ἐπανάπαυσθαι)¹ the Law, and rejoice with heart and lips in God, his King. In the Law was conveyed clearly the Divine will, so that the Jew could have no doubts about moral distinctions.

Thus it was natural for the Jew to come to regard himself as a guide of the blind, and a light to those that sat in darkness (*i.e.*, non-Jews). In the Law the Jew had the true copy—the genuine setting forth—of religious and moral truth.

To all this we should expect an apodosis of the following, or similar form: "Hence, at all costs, and above all, thou shouldst aim at a life in conformity with the Law." Instead of such an apodosis Paul gives us an attack on Jewish inconsistency in a number of questions.²

17. With σύ Paul apostrophises the unbelieving Jew. The name Ἰουδαίος became customary after the Exile: it was a honorific name, marking off the chosen people of God from the rest of the world.

In addition to the proud designation "Jew," the Jews possessed the holy Law given to them by God, and on it they rightly lean, and in it they confidently put their trust. Further, they had God as the Lord of their Covenant, and as their King, and they could boast of His special favour and protection. In the next place, the Jews are marked off from all other peoples by two important consequences of possessing the instruction contained in the Law (κατηχούμενος ἐκ τοῦ νόμου).

¹ ἐπανάπαυεσθαι occurs in Micha. iii. 11, and 1 Macc. viii. 12 in a similar sense. In Micha. iii. 11 it represents *nish'an*, to lean upon.

² In an article in *Biblica* (Vol. xi., 1930, pp. 188-215), *Sintassi, senso e rapporto col contesto di Rom. ii. 17-24*, Fr. Olivieri contends that there is nothing anacoluthic in the construction of vv. 17-24. Paul wishes to show here, Fr. Olivieri thinks, not so much the moral depravity of the Jews, as their folly in trusting in the possession of the Law as a means of justification and salvation. Verses 17-20 are the antecedent, vv. 21-22 the consequent, and vv. 23-24 the conclusion of an argument, which runs thus:

"Since thou art a Jew thou dost lean on the Law and boastest of God, etc." (εἰ = "since"). "But if thou teachest others, and teachest not thyself, etc." (οὐν = *atqui*). "Then thy disregard of that Law of which thou boastest will make it, not a means of justification, but a source of condemnation; for by not observing the Law thou dishonourest God, the Author of the Law!"

Even if Father Olivieri's construing of the text is accepted, and if the emphasis here is taken to be on the failure of the Mosaic Law as a means to justification, rather than on the corruption of the Jews, it must still be admitted that Paul here proves the necessity of a new means of salvation for the Jews from the failure of the Jews to observe the Law as shown by the corruption of their lives. This does not differ greatly from the view explained in the commentary.

18. (1) They know clearly the Divine Will.¹

(2) They can estimate with precision moral distinctions. Δοκιμάζεις may mean "test," or "approve of" (Vulgate, *probas*): τὰ διαφέροντα = either "ethical differences," or "what is preferable." Hence δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα may mean—(1) "Thou testest in each case the ethical distinctions," or (2) "Thou testest what is better," or (3) "Thou approvest of what is better."

The instruction in the Law may be the instruction received regularly in the Synagogue: ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, in that view, means, "out of the Law." If the instruction in question is due to personal study of the Law, ἐκ τοῦ νόμου may mean by reading in the Law (*per legem*).²

19-20. Paul goes on to indicate with a certain irony the rôle which Jews assume in regard to the heathens.

Πέποιθας = "thou art confident." The Jews regarded the Gentiles in comparison with themselves as spiritually blind (*cf.* Matth. xv. 14), as sitting in darkness, as intellectually inferior, as mere children.³ With this mentality Israel of the New Testament period set out, as the "Light of the Gentiles" (Is. xlix. 6) to proselytise the heathen. And there was this justification of such an attitude and policy, that the Jews of the pre-Christian period had, in fact, within their immediate reach, in the Law, the μὶμῶσις (the express embodiment, the completed form, the perfect expression, the "last word") of knowledge and truth (of Divine revelation).⁴

In verses 21-24 Paul expresses his surprise at the contrast between the claims of the Jews to be the world's guides to knowledge and truth, and their actual behaviour. What Christ had said of the official guides of the people, of His day, might be said of the Jewish missionaries to the heathen: "What they say to you, do and observe; but do not according to their actions" (Matth. xxiii. 3). Even the Sixth and the Seventh Commandments, on which they insist so strongly, they do not observe. Paul, as it were, here examines the Jewish conscience. SB quote words of a Rabbinical contemporary of Paul, Jochanan ben Zakkai, which give a similar dark picture of Jewish moral failure.

The meaning of ἱεροσυλεῖς (*v.* 22) is disputed. It has been

¹ With τὸ θέλημα we must understand θεοῦ.

² As Rickaby puts it: "Being orally taught religion out of [the books of] the Law." The Jews received a "catechesis" in the Law.

³ The Sibylline Oracles (3,195) call the Jews βίου καθοδηγοὶ for all men.

⁴ Lietzmann conjectures that Paul quotes in *v.* 19 phrases from a Jewish writing intended for Proselytes. How far may we suppose Paul to be recalling here his own Pharisaic point of view of pre-conversion days?

explained as: robbing the Jewish Temple by appropriating Temple revenues;¹ but a reference to contact with heathen worship seems to be demanded by the context. Hence the word must mean robbing heathen temples—either by profiteering in objects associated with heathen worship, or by stealing valuables from heathen temples. To profess to abhor idols and, at the same time, to make profit out of heathen worship, would imply opposition between theory and practice, for profiting in any fashion from the wealth of heathen shrines was somehow a sharing in idolatry.²

23. In view of the contrast between what the Jews claim to be and their actual manner of life Paul draws the conclusion: They who boast of the Law and what it implies (and then violate its precepts), bring dishonour on God Who gave them the Law.

24. Instead of glorifying God among the nations, they dishonour His name; for the heathens will blaspheme when they see the Jews transgressing the Law. Paul may have had personal experience of the contempt with which unworthy Jews were regarded in the great cities of the heathen world.

In v. 24 Paul has in view the text of Is. lii. 5 (according to LXX)—and possibly also Ezech. xxxvi. 16 ff. He finds the present condition of Judaism similar to that implied in the text of Isaiah: "On account of you, My name is continually reviled among the heathen." The Vulgate rendering of *δι' ὑμῶν* by *per vos* is not quite exact. Paul substitutes "the name of God" for the Isaian "My name" (Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 2).

From all that has been said it follows that the Jews are sinners, and liable to God's wrath—not in a lesser, but in a greater degree than the Gentiles. As would-be preachers of the Law they have attained, in a sense, the very negation of their own programme.

(5) *Circumcision, as such, no real advantage.* II, 25-29.

Circumcision, as such, is no real advantage, for, in spite of circumcision, Jews are sinners, and may come to eternal death.

Circumcision was the one precept of the Law which every Jew could boast of observing; but by itself, as Paul says, it cannot procure salvation.

25. Circumcision is indeed useful if the man who is circumcised

¹ Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, xviii. 3, 5.

² Pallis thinks that *ἱεροσολεῖς* has taken the place of a word suggesting the practice of magic or divination, such as *ἱεροσκοπεῖς*. This is, of course, pure conjecture.

keeps the Law ; but if a Jew fails to keep the Law, his circumcision becomes useless, and he is practically in the position of the uncircumcised. On the other hand, if an uncircumcised heathen keeps the Law, his state of non-circumcision is no longer a defect, since he stands as well with God as would a Jew. A bad Jew is no better than a Pagan : a good Pagan is equal to a Jew.

26. In this verse ἀκροβυστία = "the uncircumcised (ὁ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ ὢν). Note how ἡ ἀκροβυστία is the antecedent of αὐτοῦ. We saw above (v. 14f) that a heathen may observe the essentials of the Mosaic Law in fulfilling the Natural Law.

27. A heathen thus fulfilling the Law will be judge of the renegade Jew at the Last Judgment, just as, according to Our Lord, the men of Niniveh will be judges of those who refused to listen to His preaching (Matth. xii. 41).

Ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία is the natural condition of non-circumcision (or men physically uncircumcised), as opposed to that state of non-circumcision which the renegade Jew, in a sense, attains. The external rite of circumcision will not, of itself, favourably affect the judgment that a man receives at the Great Trial : but the loyalty of uncircumcised heathens will be a further reason for the condemnation of the disloyal Jews.

WW read here : *judicabit quod ex natura, etc.*

28. It is not purely external things that make the genuine Jew—but qualities of the heart : the genuine Jew is not he who is circumcised outwardly in the flesh, but he who has the circumcision of heart ! The Jew of circumcised heart is he who has excised from his heart its iniquities and disorderly tendencies (Cf. Jer. iv. 4 ; ix. 26 ; Deut. x. 16 ; xxx. 6 ; Ezech. xlv. 7). The "circumcision of heart" must be ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι—through the grace of the Holy Spirit, not through the letter of the Mosaic Law (*quod non fit littera docente et minante, sed spiritu adjuvante atque sanante*. Aug., *De Spirit. et litt.* 8). The external circumcision is wrought by the letter of the Mosaic Law (i.e., it is the result of that Law's command) : the internal circumcision is wrought by Divine grace (Cf. Gal. vi. 15).

29. It is the inwardly circumcised Jew, then, who is the genuine Jew—the Jew worthy of the name. Such a Jew receives from God the praise which his honourable name, "Jew," may be said to demand.¹

¹ The name *yehudah* was associated etymologically with *yadah* to praise (Gen. xxix. 35 ; xlix. 8). Pallis suggests as a parallel to this connection of ἔπαινος and *yehudah*—*yehudi*, the connection of εὐδοκία (= Χρισμός) and Χριστός in 2 Cor. ii. 15.

Men who cannot see the heart may not praise such a one, but God, the "Searcher of hearts," who sees what is hidden, will give him due reward (*Cf.* Matth. vi. 1, 4-6).

The inwardly circumcised—whether or not they are circumcised outwardly, whether they are Jews or Gentiles—constitute the genuine Israel, the "Israel of God" (*Gal.* vi. 16).

WW read here: *Neque quæ in manifesto, in carne circumcisio; sed qui in abscondito Judæus: et circumcisio, etc.*

(6) *Jewish perfidy inexcusable. Jewish objections answered.*
III, 1-8

1. The conclusion of Chapter II, that the genuine Jew is the Jew who is circumcised in heart, suggests the difficulty from the Jewish standpoint: "What then is the value of circumcision?" Is there any profit in membership of the Chosen People?"

Elsewhere (*cf.* ix. 4 f; ii. 17-20) Paul enumerates several privileges or advantages of the Chosen People. Here he deals only with one—their custodianship of the revelations and promises of God.

Κατὰ πάντα τρόπον = "however one looks at the matter" (in connection, that is, with the question of salvation). *Cf.* v. 9 below. Paul's statement here must be taken as hyperbole, for he has already shown (ii. 28 f) that Jews have no special religious superiority over the heathen.

2. Πρῶτον is not followed by ἑπείτα: πρῶτον may mean "chiefly," "primarily," "above all" (*præcipue quidem*. Aquinas)—because the advantage named is in reality the main advantage—containing others in itself. It need not be assumed that Paul intended to give an enumeration from which he was distracted by the digression up to v. 9.¹

Origen read: πρῶτοι γὰρ ἐπιστεύθησαν. We must take τὰ λόγια as an internal accusative: "they were entrusted with the oracles." The Vulgate makes τὰ λόγια the subject.

The oracles of God are the revelations—and in particular the Messianic prophecies—contained in the Old Testament (*Cf.* ix. 6).

3. The Jews had proved themselves to be untrustworthy stewards of the Divine oracles. Over and over again (*cf.* Jer. xxxi. 32) they were disloyal to the Covenant, and their

¹ Though Paul is not about to give an enumeration of privileges, the expression πρῶτον μὲν, which suggests an ἑπείτα δε, shows that he has in mind a number of privileges; he wishes, however, to mention, for the moment, only one—that one being fundamental, and inferentially inclusive of several others.

ἀπιστία stood out in contrast to the πίστις of God—the Divine loyalty to the Sinaitic compact. It might seem that the disloyalty of Israel would move God to abandon His fidelity to the Covenant. But God could not be thus influenced by men, and Paul, in any case, does not speak of complete disloyalty on Israel's part—εἰ ἠπίστησάν τινες. Note the contrast between ἐπιστεύθησαν and ἠπίστησαν.

In this explanation ἀπιστία is understood as Jewish disloyalty to the Sinaitic Covenant—the Covenant which determined the relations between God and Israel; and the point of the question in v. 3 has been taken to be: "If the Jews have violated the fundamental compact of Sinai, have they not made void God's plans for the salvation of Israel, and what then is the advantage of their guardianship of the 'Oracles'?"

It is maintained, however, by many commentators that the λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ here are primarily the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, and that the ἀπιστία refers to the failure of the Jews to accept Christ as the Messiah of the prophecies: their ἀπιστία would be *unbelief*, rather than *disloyalty*. The Jews were made custodians of the Messianic promises, and, therefore, acceptance of those promises, and, consequently, acceptance of the claims of Christ, would naturally be expected from them. Paul, on this view, rejects the thought that Jewish unbelief in regard to Christ could affect the πίστις of God—i.e., God's fidelity to the Messianic promises. The Jewish failure to believe does not release God from His promises. God is absolutely loyal to His "Oracles," no matter how disloyal and untruthful man may be. Hence custodianship of the "Oracles"—in spite of Jewish incredulity—is a real advantage.

Καταργεῖν is a favourite word of St. Paul: he uses it twenty-five times in his Letters. It means to nullify, to bring to naught.

4. Μὴ γένοιτο is used ten times in Romans. It means, "Never!" "Surely not"! It is not peculiar to Biblical Greek: indeed it is rather frequent in Hellenistic Greek. Hence there is no need to take it as a rendering of חֲלִילָה (Cf. Gen. xliv. 17).

Γινέσθω¹ δὲ, etc.: God must be true. He must stand forth as true by the fulfilment of His promises. God is Truth itself, and disloyalty to His promises in God is unthinkable.

¹ The imperative γινέσθω expresses the inevitable character of the inference. In fulfilling His promises God must appear to the whole world as loyal and truthful. Some commentators regard γινέσθω as = ἔστω, and explain it as a strong form of asseveration induced by μὴ γένοιτο. Cf. the Vulgate, *est*.

Deus secundum se verax est (Aquinas). In the very sin and disloyalty of Israel the truthfulness of God shines forth.

It is only in man that falsehood can be found. This is proved from Ps. cxvi. 11 and li. 6. The quotation from Ps. li. shows that there can be no real criticism of, no ground of objection against, the judgments of God, for His fidelity shows Him to be just and holy in His words.

David declares that God is just in dealing out punishment to him—whatever men may think thereof.

Τῷ κρίνεσθαι σε refers to the criticism to which men might subject God's chastisement of David. God's condemnation is seen to be just, and He emerges as victor (νικήσεις) from the critical scrutiny of His judgments and chastisements. Whenever God's dealings with Israel are looked into, He will be found to have been just ("justice" and "fidelity" are here closely associated). Chapter XI develops this point—that history establishes the truthfulness of God.

Note the Greek passive κρίνεσθαι, which contrasts with the Hebrew, בְּשִׁפְטֶךָ—"when Thou judgest."

No further privileges of the Jews are mentioned until ix. 4 f.—and then in quite a different kind of context. Many commentators think that Paul here forgot that he had begun an enumeration with πρῶτον in v. 2. As said above, however, it is not necessary to suppose that πρῶτον really begins an enumeration; it may mean "above all," or something similar (*vide supra*).

5. The passage from Ps. li. suggests the thought that the holiness of God is brought out into greater relief by contrast with man's sinfulness.

Might it not then be fairly argued that, since sin contributes to God's glory, God cannot justly punish sin?

"If *our* injustice establishes (συνίστημι = make good by argument, emphasise, prove, establish: cf. Gal. ii. 18) the justice of God, what shall we say?"¹ Paul puts himself with the Jews in "*our* injustice"; ἀδικία is here wider than ἀπιστία. Τὶ ἐροῦμεν occurs seven times in Romans, but nowhere else in Paul.

In order to put away at once all suggestion of blasphemy Paul adds, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω—"I speak according to mere human logic" (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 8; Gal. iii. 15; Rom. vi. 19). The phrase does not imply that Paul is here giving the view of an adversary.

God's justice is emphasised in the condemnation of sinners.

¹ WW read: *Numquid iniquus Deus*.

Is it not better, then, that there should be sins to be condemned? How, then, can God be angry with sinners?

6. The answer is: Surely not! For how then could God judge the world?

The κόσμος here is not the heathen world only, but the whole world. The Jews believed that God would judge the world. But if Divine justice were incompatible with the punishment of sin, God could not really judge the world, since there would be no possibility of condemnation. A verdict of acquittal would be certain beforehand, and the judgment of the world would become an absurdity. But no Jew could admit such a position.¹

Some commentators take κόσμος as the non-Jewish world, and put the argument thus: "If God must acquit Israel in spite of its sin, how can He justly condemn the 'world' on account of sin, at the Judgment?" That the "world," understood in this sense, would be condemned at the Great Judgment was a commonplace of Jewish thought. In this explanation κρίνει is regarded as meaning "condemn."

There seems, however, to be little justification for limiting κόσμος to the non-Jewish, or heathen world. Abraham's words, in Gen. xviii. 25: "Shall not the Judge of the whole earth exercise justice **לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה מִשְׁפָּט**?" contain practically the same implication that is here in Paul's question. World-administration and world-judgment (= the moral order), essentially postulate the absolute justice of God (Cf. Job. xxxiv. 17-18).

7. The point here is not the same as in v. 5. Those who take κόσμος in v. 6 in the limited sense of non-Jewish world regard the objection here as put by a member of that κόσμος:

"If the truth of God appears evidently through my falsehood, why am I (as distinct from the Jews) condemned as a sinner?" The Jews, of course, looked on non-Jews generally as "sinners."

But it is better to take the objection as made by the Jew whose ἀπιστία is spoken of in v. 3.

If the truth of God is made still more manifest by my sin, and my sin for that reason is really not a sin, why am I, who in fact publish forth the glory of God, condemned as a sinner?

The objection is a Jewish objection against the condemnation of the Jews as sinners, and, therefore, as deserving of chastisement. What promotes the glory of God cannot deserve condemnation. If the Jews, then, by their false-

¹ WW read: *Quo modo judicabit Deus mundum, omitting hunc.*

hoods only emphasise God's truth, and increase His glory, they ought not to be condemned and punished as sinners.

The "truth of God" is God's fidelity in executing His threats: the "lie" of the Jew includes generally the disloyalty of the Jews in spite of God's threats.

8. It would be reasonable to expect here at the beginning of v. 8, καὶ μὴ λέγωμεν. It would appear as if Paul's first intention had been to continue here, καὶ μὴ ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά—but that, remembering his adversaries, he inserted βλασφημούμεθα. The construction ought to have been: "And why do we not say—as we are slanderously reported by some to say—"Let us do evil that good may come?"

The text is confused in construction, but the general sense is clear enough. If the condemnation and punishment of the sinner were to be regarded as unjust because, in fact, men's sins contribute to God's glory, then the very absurd principle would follow: "Let us do evil that good may come." This principle is so detestable, and so opposed to sound reason, that Paul accuses of "blasphemy—i.e., slander, those who ascribe it to him (Cf. for "blasphemy," 1 Cor. x. 30.)

The condensed and somewhat confused form of expression in v. 8 is due to the attempt to express at the same time Paul's abhorrence of the principle that the end justifies the means, and his indignation at those who slanderously ascribe that principle to him (Cf. vi. 1 ff.).

ὥν τὸ κρίμα ἔνδικόν ἐστιν: These are probably rather those who taught the principle that the end justifies the means, than those who ascribed it to Paul. Those who ascribed it to Paul were probably his Jewish enemies.

In spite of their privileges the Jews will share the fate of the heathen because they also have provoked the anger of God. Scripture makes it clear that all men are under sin (iii. 9-20).

(7) *Scripture proof of Jewish Corruption.* III, 9-20.

9. Τί οὖν; etc.: This is a question of the Jews, who are displeased with Paul's answers so far. Have the Jews then any advantage whatever over the Gentiles? WW. read: *Quid igitur?*

The answer is οὐ πάντως. In Classical Greek this would mean "not absolutely," "not altogether," and many commentators accept that sense here. The Jews have, indeed, advantages over the heathen, but not such as give them an absolute superiority over them. Other commentators main-

tain that the phrase means, "Not at all," "Absolutely none" (= πάντως οὐ): the Jews that is, have absolutely no advantage over the heathen in regard to the anger of God. The sense is not that the Jews have no advantage whatever over the heathen—for that would contradict iii. 2, but that, in respect of escaping the wrath of God, they have no advantage. The Vulgate, *nequaquam*, implies this interpretation; Theophylact and the Greek commentators generally explain also, ὀυδαμῶς.

The suggestion that οὐ πάντως may = לֹא כֻלָּם (not all of them) has also been made—but that would require πάντες, not πάντως:

The reading is not quite certain. These are two main types of tradition:

(1) τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως.

(2) τί οὖν κατέχομεν περίσسون; (omitting οὐ πάντως).¹

Προητιασάμεθα—(ἡτιασάμεθα also occurs)—the previous accusation referred to is that in Chapters I and II. There also universal sinfulness has been proved.

Under Sin—under the power of sin. Sin is here personified as a sort of dominating demoniac power. The reference here is primarily to actual sin, but the thought of original sin is not excluded.

10. Paul now goes on to show that his charge of universal sinfulness is borne out by Scripture.²

11-18. The various Psalm-texts and the Isaian text quoted are taken by Paul as referring to men generally. Neither Jew nor Gentile is excluded. Note how in vv. 13, 14 the various organs of speech—throat, tongue, lips, and mouth—are brought together—as if to hint that evil speech is a very fruitful source of depravity and corruption.

In this mosaic of texts, five Psalm passages and one

¹ It has been held that προεχόμεθα nowhere else has the sense given to it in the text of this commentary, and that the Vulgate rendering, *Præcellimus eos*, is incorrect. There is a good deal of uncertainty as to the exact force of προεχόμεθα, and that uncertainty has, probably, given rise to the variant textual type 2, with its perfect simplicity and clearness. In the secondary variants προεχόμεθα is replaced by προσεχόμεθα, προερχόμεθα, περιερχόμεθα. The Peshitta favours Type 2. Rickaby and the Westminster Version take προσεχόμεθα in a passive sense. "In what then are we excelled"? (R.): "How then? Are we in worse case"? (W.) But while Rickaby takes the reference in προεχόμεθα to be to God, victory over men in their suit with Him, and renders οὐ πάντως, "Is it not in every way"? the Editors of the W.V. take οὐ πάντως as = "Not at all"!—as if the sense were, that the Jews are no worse off than the Gentiles.

Lietzmann suggests that Paul uses προεχόμεθα in the sense of the active.

² That all men are sinners was also the teaching of Rabbinical Theology. Cf. SB. iii. 155-157—especially the answer of Rabbi Akiba to R. Elieser: "Thou hast taught us that no man on earth is just—that no man does only good and sins not" (Sanhed. 101a).

passage from Isaias (lix. 7-8) are combined. The Psalm texts are:

(a) xiii. 1-3 (= Ps. lii. 2-4)	= vv. 10-12.
(b) v. 10	... = v. 13 a, b.
(c) cxxxix. 4	... = v. 13 c.
(d) ix. 29 (?)	... = v. 14.
(e) xxxv. 2	... = v. 18.

The Isaian text is interesting as compared with the LXX text of the passage.

The verses 13-18 have passed as a unity into the Vulgate Psalm xiii. Verses 10-12 are a quotation of Psalm xiii. 1-3.

In the Codex Vaticanus this Pauline mosaic of Psalm texts is inserted in Ps. xiii. Paul elsewhere, also, in analagous fashion, combines Scripture texts to establish an argument. Cf. Gal. iv. 30.

ἡχρεώθησαν (v. 12) = to go bad, to become sour, or insipid.

"Under their lips" (v. 13) is quite correct, for the venom is in the bite and not in the adder's forked tongue.

The simile of the open grave implies that the words which come forth from their throat are foul, like the pestilential air that comes from an open grave.

19. There can be no doubt that Gentile corruption is established by the Scripture passages quoted—for the texts are universal.¹ And since Old Testament texts must, of their nature, primarily though, of course, not solely, concern the Jews (οἱ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ), the passages quoted are an irrefutable proof of Jewish depravity, and exclude all possibility of further arguing on the part of the Jews. Every mouth then, whether Jewish or Gentile, is shut. The whole world (Jewish and Gentile) has violated God's Law and made itself liable to God's punishments: ὑπόδικος is one who has committed a fault and has thus made himself liable to trial or condemnation; here ὑπόδικος τῷ θεῷ = ὑπὸ δίκην τοῦ θεοῦ ὦν.
20. The "Law" is the Mosaic Law—the νόμος in itself as a system. Over against the νόμος thus understood is the "Gospel" as a δύνανμις εἰς σωτηρίαν. The "works of the Law," as far as the phrase goes, might mean works accomplished by the Law, and then οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου would mean that the Law of itself has not the power, or capacity, to produce justification. But it is much more natural to take "works of the Law" as meaning works prescribed by the Law (Cf. ii. 15).

¹ Since the texts here quoted (10-18) are all from the "Prophets" and the "Writings," Paul obviously means by "Law" in 19a the Scripture generally, and not the *Torah* merely.

Πᾶσα σάρξ is a Hebraism, meaning every man (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 29; 1 Pet. i. 24)—or πᾶς ζῶν. Paul seems to have in view here Ps. cxliii. 2, οὐ δικαιοθήσεται ἐνώπιον σοῦ πᾶς ζῶν.¹ He says practically the same thing again in Gal. ii. 16: οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου. No man can justify himself before God by observing the Law.

This seems, at first sight, to contradict ii. 13: "Those who do the Law will be declared just"! There is, however, no contradiction. In ii. 13 there is question of the Last Judgment—in which each will be requited according to his works (ii. 6): here there is question of attaining to justification. For this faith is necessary (i. 17), but works are unavailing. The just of the Old Testament period became just, not by doing the works of the Law, but by believing in the Promised Redeemer. Their observance of the Law was, in reality, the fruit of their justification, not the source, or cause, of it.

The Law brought, indeed, knowledge of sin but not its remission, or justification. It was designed to make men conscious of their own sinfulness, and so to make them long for the Promised Redeemer.

In ch. vii. 7 ff. we shall hear how the Law imparts consciousness of sin. The general function of the Law is rather negative than positive. It points out what is sinful, what men are to avoid; but it does not produce justification. The positive way of salvation is through faith in Christ—through the Gospel as a δύναμις εἰς σωτηρίαν.

It may seem strange that Paul, writing to a Church of Gentile Christians, should take such pains to portray the corruption and the need of salvation of the Jews. It must be remembered, however, that Judaism was the great adversary of Pauline preaching everywhere, and that Paul had to be constantly on the defensive against Judaisers who taught that to become a genuine Christian, a man must first become a Jew. It is quite possible that Judaisers had been active at Rome even before Paul wrote this letter; but, in any case, they were sure to appear sometime in the Church at Rome. It was, therefore, of importance for Paul to show—and especially to show from the Old Testament itself—that Jews, as well as heathens, were objects of God's wrath and were equally with the heathens, in need of the saving help of the Gospel. It should, further, be remembered that the Greek Old Testament was widely known in the Mediterranean world in the New Testament period, and that it would be perfectly natural for Christian converts from

¹ *Cf.* Job. iv. 17; Henoch 81, 5.

heathenism to seek confirmation for their faith in the close study of the divine oracles of the Old Testament. The frequent quoting of the Old Testament throughout the remainder of this Epistle is to be accounted for in analogous fashion. It is quite unreasonable to explain the extensive use of the Old Testament in Romans as an argument for an alleged preponderance of Jewish Christians in the Roman Church.

II. THE CHRISTIAN WAY OF SALVATION. III, 21-IV, 25

(a) JUSTIFICATION THROUGH FAITH. III, 21-30

(1) *Justification through Faith in Jesus.* III, 21-26

In the preceding discussion Paul has shown the moral depravity and the need of a real "power unto salvation" of both heathens and Jews. He now goes on to explain the salvation which Christ has purchased for all by His blood, and to show that each one—whether Jew or heathen—can take to himself that salvation by means of faith in Christ Jesus.

21. Νυνί = ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ (cf. vi. 22; xv. 23, 25): it is temporal, not logical. "Now" is the new period of history which has been inaugurated by Christ. The days of the Law are over, and there is in force a new Dispensation—a chief feature of which is implied in χωρὶς νόμου. In the Old Dispensation everything had been effected διὰ νόμου. Περανέρωται is to be read with χωρὶς νόμου. The "justice of God" here is the same as in i. 17—the justice which comes from God, and holds good before God. That justice has "now" been manifested to the whole world, and made accessible to all—*manifestata et exhibita* (Estius). That justice is not something new or unheard of: it was announced long ago by the Law and the Prophets. The witness borne to it by the Old Testament is, of course, mainly that of the Messianic Texts. As Augustine has it: *Novum testamentum in vetere latet, et Vetus in Novo patet.*
22. This is a further determination of God's justice: it is available through faith in Jesus Christ, and it is, therefore, accessible to all who believe in Him;¹ and, in regard to the possibility of attaining it, there is no distinction (διαστολή) between Jew and Greek. The Law was given to the Jews—

¹ The reading of WW is: *per fidem Jesu Christi, super omnes qui credunt non enim est distinctio.*

not to men generally, and it, therefore, could not be a universal means of justification; but all can believe in Christ Jesus, and hence all can have access to the justice of God, which has been manifested to all in the new period.

The justice of God is through faith in Jesus Christ—i.e., faith in Jesus is not the justice in question, but the means to it. Supernatural faith is the first and most necessary condition which a man must, with God's grace, satisfy in order to attain justification (*Cf.* x. 9).

It is impossible to take πιστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ here as meaning "Jesus Christ's faith," as if men were justified by the intensity of Christ's own faith. Neither is it possible, as some have proposed, to omit Ἰησοῦ (or Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) in iii. 22, 26, (and Gal. ii. 16; iii. 22). Supernatural faith in Christ Jesus is the necessary pre-condition of justification.

Εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας: If we accept this text, ἐπὶ πάντας must be regarded as a sort of reinforcement of εἰς πάντας. Lietzmann argues that the primitive text had εἰς πάντας only: an old variation of this was ἐπὶ πάντας, and the present reading is a combination of the two.

23. The preceding discussion has shown how true it is that all have sinned. All, therefore, are lacking in (ὑστεροῦνται—an abiding condition resulting from sinful acts—ἥμαρτον) true justice; but all ought to be in a position to secure it.

Πάντες ἥμαρτον is a resumé of i. 18—iii. 19 (but it may include also indirectly a reference to Original Sin). What is lacking is the "glory of God"—which, like δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ is something (as the word ὑστεροῦνται implies) that God gives to man.¹ The "glory" is that gift which makes men share in the glory of the divine nature—sanctifying grace. As à Lapide puts it: *Gratia est gloria quædam incohata, sicut gloria est gratia consummata*. Objectively the "justice of God" and the "glory of God" are the same thing. For the expression "glory of God," *cf.* v. 2; viii. 18, 30; 1 Cor. iv. 5.

In using the expression Paul may possibly (as Schaefer thinks) have in mind the *Shekinah*, the manifest dwelling of God in Israel. *Cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 16: "The Spirit of God dwells in you"—where there may be an analogous suggestion of the שְׁכִינָה.

24. The "glory" which they lack is given to men by justification—i.e., by their being δικαιούμενοι (which here has some such meaning as, "and they are to be justified").

¹ For the meaning of ὑστεροῦνται, *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 7; viii. 8: it does not mean that men have so far failed to reach their goal, but simply that they are devoid of, or lacking in something. The Vulgate *egent* expresses the same thought.

The justification is to be δωρεάν—i.e., after the manner of a gift, or favour, gratuitously, not as a something deserved, or earned.

This justification, then, which is no mere forensic thing, but a positive robe of glory, cannot be earned or merited: it is *absque merito præcedentium operum* (Aquinas). Even though faith must precede justification, that faith itself is not possible without God's grace, and it neither produces justification nor merits it. As Trent (Sess. vi., cap. 8) says: *Gratis justificari ideo dicimur quia nihil eorum, quæ justificationem præcedunt, sive fides sive opera, ipsam justificationem promeretur* ("merit," that is, *de condigno*).

Τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι = the efficient cause of justification. Commentators differ in explaining the precise meaning of χάρις here. Lag. seems to take it, not as sanctifying grace directly, but as the gratuitous goodness of God.¹ Gutjahr takes it as being, not merely the infused habitual grace of justification, but also every preventing and accompanying grace in the whole process of justification. Without defining it too precisely, we can understand it simply as the divine grace which as *causa efficiens* transforms the sinner into a just man.

Διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως, etc.—expresses the meritorious cause of justification—the sacrificial death of Christ (*Cf.* Trent, Sess. vi., cap. 7). The ransoming (ἀπολύτρωσις—Chrysostom notes that Paul does not say, simply λύτρωσις) was wrought by Jesus, who by His blood set us free from the slavery of Sin (*Cf.* v. 9 above; John viii. 34). Jesus Himself declared that He would "give His life as a ransom for many" (Mark x. 45; Matth. xx. 28).

25. The redemptive work of Jesus is more fully explained.

Ὁν προέθετο, etc.: προέθετο does not refer to predetermining or foreordaining on the part of God. God has set forth² (*proposuit*) Jesus before the eyes of all as a ἱλαστήριον—i.e., either (a) as a means of propitiation or (b) as a propitiatory sacrifice. In the LXX ἱλαστήριον is the *kapporeth*, the cover of the Ark, which was sprinkled with atoning blood on the Feast of Atonement (Exod. xxv. 17 ff; Lev. xvi. 2, 13, 14, etc.), and, if ἱλαστήριον, in the present passage has any immediate relation to the technical use of the word in the Old Testament, it would perhaps be best rendered, "means of propitiation," or "instrument of propitiation." On the other hand, on the analogy of words like σωτήριον (= thanks-

¹ Wobbe, *Der Charis-Gedanke bei Paulus* (36 f) understands χάρις here as the graciousness of God: "by His grace" W. regards as a mere emphasising of δωρεάν; justification is given as a pure gift which God in His graciousness imparts.

² Referring to the raising up of Christ on the Cross.

giving sacrifice for rescue), χαριστήριον (= thanksgiving sacrifice), καθάρσιον (= purification sacrifice), ἱλαστήριον ought to mean "propitiatory sacrifice." This sense is borne out by the clause ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι—which is to be read with ἱλαστήριον. In order to be a ἱλαστήριον Christ must shed His blood, for through the blood is produced atonement (Lev. xviii. 11; Heb. ix. 22). (Note how αὐτοῦ marks off Christ's Sacrifice from the Old Testament Sacrifices.) The word ἱλαστήριον is an adjectival formation from ἰλάσκομαι. As an adjective it ought to mean "propitiating," "reconciling," and some commentators take it here as an adjective with θῦμα understood (comparing for the thought, Eph. v. 2; Heb. x. 12 ff.).

If ἱλαστήριον were taken as the masculine of the adjective used substantively it might be rendered "Reconciler." The Vulgate "*propitiatio*" leaves the sense somewhat indefinite, and that is prudent, for it is quite possible that Paul has several nuances of the word ἱλαστήριον before his mind in this passage.

It has been already said that ἱλαστήριον is to be read along with "in His blood"; but between the two is inserted διὰ πίστεως—to indicate that it is by faith that a man participates in the power and effect of the Sacrifice. It is another token of the extraordinary importance which Paul assigns to faith in the process of justification. *Mors Christi nobis applicatur per fidem qua eum credimus per suam mortem mundum redemisse* (Aquinas) (Cf. Gal. ii. 20).

26. Εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, etc.: Paul having mentioned the Sacrifice of the Cross goes on now to show that the Sacrifice of God's Son, great and terrible as it was, could alone satisfy the justice of God, so that in the very immensity of the Sacrifice we have a proof of the rigour and exactitude of the divine justice. The end of the redemptive work of Christ was to show forth—to make manifest (εἰς ἔνδειξιν) the avenging justice of God (not the justice of i. 17, iii. 21, etc.). For a long time God had, with marvellous patience, allowed men's sins to go without punishment; but now, in demanding the Sacrifice of Jesus as an atonement for men's sins, God has made clear both the enormity of men's guilt, and the rigour of His own vindictive justice.

It is implied that there have been two periods of divine policy towards men's sins. In the first of these there was, on God's side, πάρεσις of sin—a sort of toleration of sin, a period when chastisement was not meted out to sin. Πάρεσις is rather *prætermissio* than *remissio* (Vulgate): the word is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament. The period of

πάρεσις was also the time of God's patience (ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ)—the whole pre-Christian period. No dreadful punishment for sin reflecting even slightly its guilt—except the Deluge, was inflicted by God for sin in that period, so that it might have seemed as if God took little heed of sin.

In the second period (ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ) the magnitude of the ransom which God has demanded for sinners, and which Christ has paid—is a clear proof of the greatness of the injury done to God by sin in the period when He seemed not to care.

The death of the Son of God shows forth drastically the justice of God. But the justice which is thus displayed is not the avenging, or vindictive justice of the Judge merely; the justice shown forth is rather moral perfection in general—that perfection which is sometimes called “justice,” and sometimes “holiness”: in demanding the death of His Son God showed His rigorous justice, but in that death, as the death of His own Son, was revealed His infinite mercy and graciousness—His “holiness.”

Εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον, etc.: In the death of His Son God does not only display that avenging justice which He seemed to have put aside, as it were, in the time of His patience, but He shows His salvific justice, too—i.e., His mercy—when He makes the death of His Son the source of grace for the sinner. Thus that which reveals His justice also manifests His mercy. His “justice,” that is, reveals itself in the work of salvation: it takes hold of men, and transforms them from sinners into just men if they believe in Jesus Christ.

Τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ: Here again the need of faith for justification is emphasised—ὁ ἐκ πίστεως = ὁ πιστεύων.

The use of δικαιούντα here implies that God endows the believer in Jesus with His own δίκαιον εἶναι—that He makes the believer just after the model of God. Here again, then, it is obvious that when Paul speaks of the justice by which God justifies men, he has in view, not something external and merely forensic, but rather something intrinsic. To declare men just without making them internally just would be a token of the poverty, rather than of the wealth, of God's justice. Besides God could not declare a man just who was not really just. Chrysostom, commenting on the present verse, says that the ἰγenuine ἐνδειξις δικαιοσύνης is τὸ μὴ μόνον αὐτὸν εἶναι δίκαιον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἑτέρους ἐν ἁμαρτίαις κατασπέντας ἐξαίφνης δικαίους ποιεῖν.

In verse 26 then, as in verse 25, it is emphasised that the death of Christ is a monument at once to God's justice, and to His infinite love and mercy.

(2) *The Futility of Jewish Boasting.* III, 27-30

27. Ποῦ οὖν ἡ καύχησις, etc. : Paul turns again to the Jews as in *v.* 9. They boast of their Law, and of the justice which they claim to acquire by doing the works of the Law. But all that boasting is futile because it is excluded by the new economy of salvation which looks for faith, and not for works of the Law.

If a man is justified gratuitously by God's grace through the medium of faith, how can there be any reason for Jewish boasting? (*Cf.* ii. 17 f). That boasting is excluded by a new "Law" which demands not works but faith. "Law" is here not the Mosaic Law; it means a system, or economy, or norm, of justification. The new νόμος is not like the Mosaic νόμος—which prescribed and prohibited without giving strength for the fulfilment of its demands; the Christian νόμος leads through divinely granted faith and grace to justice, and, therefore, excludes the self-acquired justice based on circumcision and the fulfilment of the Mosaic Law, of which the Jews boasted. It excludes equally, of course, every other theory of justification wrought by merely human effort.

28. Λογίζομεθα = "we are firmly convinced." This fulness of conviction had been borne in on Paul by his vision-experience at Damascus, and by the wonderful success of the Mission to the Gentiles. It had become absolutely clear to Paul that God had established, on the death of His Son, a new system of justification: and Paul's statement of that system is δικαιούσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. Here every word is important.

The statement concerns first justification: ἄνθρωπον implies complete universalism, so that the principle laid down is to be taken as true of all. The justification, then, by which any man becomes just, is effected without works of the Law. By opposing πίστις as a basis of justification to ἔργα νόμου, Paul makes it clear that the "works of the Law" in question are religious and moral activities that precede faith, and are unable to procure justification—*opera fidei præcedentia vel non a fide profecta*. Paul does not, of course, exclude from the process of justification disposing acts, in which the "faith," as it were, unfolds, or develops, itself—acts of confidence, and repentance, and resolutions of amendment (*Cf.* iv. 17 f). He wishes only to state that it is not a man's fulfilment of Jewish, or other, prescriptions, that supplies the basis for his justification, but only his faith in Christ. Even in the Old Dispensation, faith was, precisely as it is now, the sole means of approach to salvation.

Since verse 28 deals with first justification, it gives no basis for the theory that faith *alone* justifies—as if nothing more were necessary for salvation than belief in Christ as Redeemer.

Even the faith which is required for first justification is not a mere abstract, intellectual faith : it is accompanied by a variety of other acts, and by an attitude of readiness to do all that follows from the acceptance of Christ as Lord and Saviour. We have seen in ch. ii. 6 that men will be judged according to their works ; and in Galatians v. 6 Paul says clearly : ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή τι ἰσχύει οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη (Cf. Jas. i. 22 ; ii. 26).

It is not works of the Christian life that Paul here excludes, but works which might be regarded as demanding, or deserving, first justification. Elsewhere (Eph. ii. 8) Paul makes it plain that even the very faith which is necessary for justification is itself a gratuitous divine gift : τῇ γὰρ χάριτι ἔστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ πίστεως· καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον· οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἵνα μὴ τις καυχῆσθαι.

There can, obviously, be no ground for the boasting of any individual within a system of salvation in which the basis and starting-point must be regarded as a free gift of God.

29-31. As there is but one God, He is God of both περιτομή and ἀκροβυστία, and the means of justification which He supplies can not, therefore, be one that is procurable by the περιτομή alone : it must be accessible to both. If a man could be justified only by the works of the Jewish Law, it would follow that God cared only for the Jews—since to them alone He gave the Mosaic Law. The argument is not that, because God is one, the means of justification must be the same for all—but that the means of justification must not be such as to belong exclusively to any group. God could have ordained different means to justification for Jews and Gentiles—but He could not fairly have established only one means which belonged *exclusively* to one group. In fact, however, God has established *one* means of justification which is accessible to all, and that means is faith in Jesus Christ.¹

The difference of prepositions in περιτομήν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως is a mere *varietas locutionis*—as Augustine says, for literary effect. It does not suggest, as some commentators think, that the heathens are justified by something which had been quite foreign to them, while the

¹ WW. read : *quoniam quidem unus Deus.*

Jews had already the principle or embryo of faith in themselves.

Ὅς δικαιώσει: The future is a logical future; the relative clause means “And therefore (since He is the sole God of all), He will judge.” The ordinary Vulgate text has the present *qui justificat*; the Greek future expresses a permanent truth which follows from the foregoing argument. The Vulgate, as it stands, may be regarded as expressing the same truth, though not in the form of a logical inference.

WW. read here: *qui justificabit*.

(b) JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH TAUGHT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. THE JUSTIFICATION OF ABRAHAM. III, 31–IV, 25

(1) *Abraham Justified by Faith without Works*. III, 31–IV, 8

Though faith is so vitally important for justification, the doctrine of justification by faith does not deprive the Mosaic Law of its importance. On the contrary, it confirms that Law, for the doctrine in question is found in the “Law”—being clearly taught in the first book of the Torah of Moses (Gen. xv. 6). Elsewhere Paul shows that the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ is, in a sense, the goal towards which the Law tended, and that it is therefore the completion, and not the abrogation of the Law. In the present context he shows that “works” played no part in the justification of Abraham—but only *faith*. Hence Abraham was justified “by faith, without works of the Law.”

31. Most commentators take νόμος here as the Mosaic Law generally. Some, less probably, regard it as meaning only the norm, or system, of justification found in the Old Testament. The difficulty raised would occur to a Jewish mind.

καταργεῖν = abrogate, overthrow, nullify.

ιστάειν = establish, validate, bring to full validity.

διὰ τῆς πίστεως = by the theory of justification by faith.

Just as Our Lord asserted that He had not come to change the Law (Matth. v. 17), so Paul emphasises the full harmony of his teaching with that of the Old Testament.

- 1–3. Paul’s Jewish adversaries would readily admit that Abraham’s justice is affirmed in Gen. xv. 6, and Paul seeks to prove that that text implies the justifying of Abraham “by faith without works of the Law.” Note how, in the question, Paul puts himself as a Jew along with his Jewish opponents, and speaks of “*our* ancestor.”

The question has been variously understood by commentators :

- (a) What did our ancestor Abraham find according to the flesh ?
- (b) What did Abraham our ancestor according to the flesh find ?

In (a) εὐηκέναι is read with κατὰ σάρκα, and this phrase is taken as contrasted with κατὰ πνεῦμα in the sense, "according to the natural man," or, "according to the non-justified man," or, "by his own works" (ἐξ ἔργων).

For (a) it is argued that it is demanded by the whole context, and that a considerable number of Greek MSS. and the Peshitta version place "Abraham our ancestor" before εὐηκέναι, and that emphasis on the carnal or physical paternity of Abraham, as in (b), is here out of place.¹ It is intelligible that Abraham acquired nothing κατὰ σάρκα, but it is against Paul's reasoning to say that "Abraham our ancestor according to the flesh," acquired nothing whatever.

The argument in verses 2 and 3 according to (a) can be analysed in the following manner. The answer demanded by the question is "Nothing!" ; but Paul hurries on to his main point without waiting to give an answer. If Abraham were justified through his own works, he would have a καύχημα—a reason of boasting of his justification—since, *ex hypothesi*, he would have earned it. But, in fact, he has no ground of boasting against God (or before God). Hence he was not justified by his own works.

That Abraham had no ground of boasting against God is proved from Gen. xv. 6, which makes it clear that justification was given to Abraham out of God's pure graciousness, and not on the basis of specific performance—that it was granted, therefore, as a favour (χάρις), and not given as a wage (μισθός). Gen. xv. 6 seems, then, to establish the χάρις ἔργων of iii. 28.

¹ There are three forms of the text :

- (a) εὐηκέναι is put before Ἀβραάμ (so in SAC, Bohairic, Sahidic, DG, Vulgate, etc.).
- (b) εὐηκέναι follows Ἀβ. τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν (so KLR, Peshitta, etc.).
- (c) εὐηκέναι is omitted (so B, Origen, Chrys).

Lietzmann accepts (a) as the primitive text of which (b) and (c) are very ancient variants. He thinks that (b) arose through a scribal accident, and that because of the slight obscuring of meaning which it produced, the word εὐηκέναι came to be dropped. Dodd accepts (c) as the original reading, and renders : "But if so, what can we say about Abraham, our forefather by natural descent?" Obviously the omission of εὐηκέναι would render the discussion in the commentary unnecessary : but the textual evidence is much stronger for the retention of εὐηκέναι than for its omission.

The question read as in (b) implies a contrast between *fleshly* ancestor and *spiritual* ancestor. For (b) it is argued against (a) that κατὰ σάρκα in Paul never has the meaning "according to the natural, or non-justified, man," or, "in purely natural fashion" (= *operibus et virtutibus naturalibus*), whereas the meaning "carnal" or "physical" is quite suitable. It is contended, further, that the suggestion of a contrast between carnal and spiritual Sonship of Abraham is perfectly in place in this context, and that the reading of the better Greek MSS. supports (b). Moreover, the advocates of (b) maintain that the obvious answer to the question is not "Nothing," since the question really means, "What kind of justice did Abraham, our carnal ancestor, find?"

Advocates of (b) explain the argument in *vv.* 2-3 thus :

The question put means : What justice did Abraham find ? The implied answer is : He was justified, not by works, but by faith. This last proposition is then proved by a sort of syllogism :

Major: εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραάμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη ἔχει καύχημα.

Minor: ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς θεόν.

(The minor is proved from Gen. xv. 6, which shows that it was Abraham's faith, not his works, that God "reckoned" to him unto justice).

Conclusion (suppressed) : Abraham, therefore, according to Scripture, received justification as a free gift on the basis of faith, so that all boasting is excluded.

Thus, whether we adopt (a) or (b), the conclusion is substantially the same.

Ἐξ ἔργων, as referred to Abraham, cannot be restricted to works of the Mosaic Law (for in Abraham's time that Law was not yet enacted) ; it includes all analogous works preceding justification. Καύχημα (as distinguished from καύχησις) means an object or ground of boasting (Vulgate, *gloriam*) : πρὸς θεόν means, probably, rather *adversus Deum* than *apud Deum* (Vulgate). The boasting against God would arise from the proud consciousness of having, by personal effort, established a sort of a claim against God. There is no suggestion in the context of boasting against other men, for there is no question here of alleged, or seeming, justice, but only of genuine justice.

The LXX text of Gen. xv. 6 is almost exactly reproduced—the only change being the substitution here of ἐπίστευσεν δὲ for καὶ ἐπίστευσεν.

In the Hebrew of Gen. xv. 6 we have : " And he believed in Yahweh, and He (Yahweh) reckoned it to him as justice." The Hebrew text means that God looked so graciously on the faith of Abraham, and accepted it so benevolently, and estimated it so highly, that, out of pure graciousness and favour, He reckoned it to Abraham as true justice and holiness.

According to Gen. xv. 6, then, God imparted to Abraham (in view of the eternally decreed atoning work of Christ) on account of his faith, the grace of genuine holiness and justice. The imputing of justice by God implies that justice was really imparted to Abraham. Merely forensic justice—*justitia imputativa*—cannot be reconciled, in the case, with our notion of God's knowledge and veracity.

Abraham's faith was complete and supernatural; it included total surrender of his understanding, will, and actions to God as revealing His plans—i.e., it was belief, *propter auctoritatem ipsius Dei revelantis*. Abraham's perfect faith was not merely a *credere Deo*, but a *credere in Deum*—involving love for God, unlimited trust in God, and resignation to God's will. This appears clearly in verses 17 ff below.

The general object of Abraham's faith was the divinely-promised posterity (carnal and spiritual) that was to be his; and his faith included, therefore, the Messianic Hope. Thus the faith of Abraham was, implicitly at least, belief in the Saviour of the world; and considered in deeper analysis, his justification was the anticipated fruit of the atoning sacrifice of Christ. Thus, both in its nature and object, the justifying faith of Abraham was essentially the same as the *fides theologica*, which is the "beginning" and "root" of our justification.

The Genesis text quoted shows, then, that ἔργα had no part in the justification of Abraham; his πιστεύειν is ascribed to him εἰς δικαιοσύνην, and the ascription (λογίζεσθαι) is an act of grace, not the payment of a wage, or the discharging of a debt. In vv. 4-5, Paul will explain more fully the contrast between wage-earning and being justified; but Gen. xv. 6 makes it clear enough for him that "works" were not a factor in the justification of Abraham.

As it cannot well be doubted that Abraham was God's friend prior to Gen. xv. 6, it may seem strange that Paul should deal with that text as if it recorded the first justification of the Patriarch. Hence some commentators have supposed that Abraham's πιστεύειν here is his habitual faith which he elicited both before and after Gen. xv. 6; and they have suggested that the "justice" of Gen. xv. 6 is the

“justice” generally in which he became participant by his faith.

It is probable, however, that the distinction of first justification and progress in justice is not here definitely before the mind of Paul, and that he quotes Gen. xv. 6 simply because it is peculiarly suitable for his purpose, without seeking to determine the precise stage of holiness which it ascribes to Abraham.

- 4-5. When a man has worked for a wage, the wage is not assigned to him out of grace or favour, but out of obligation. If then a man were justified by his works, justice would be reckoned to him as a wage—it would not be reckoned to him as a gift or favour. But in the case of Abraham it was not as to one that had performed works (τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ), but as to one that *believed* in Him who justifies the sinner, that his faith (as we have seen from Gen. xv. 6) was reckoned unto justice. Hence Abraham received justification as a gracious gift in view of his faith: he received it κατὰ χάριν, and not κατὰ ὀφείλημα.

In v. 4 the μισθός would be justification, and the “work” done by the ἐργαζόμενος would be natural acts preceding faith and first justification. Within the Christian life itself a man who is an ἐργαζόμενος, in vital union with Christ, may have a claim to reward; but such a one has no καύχημα πρὸς θεόν, and Paul, in speaking here of μισθός, is not thinking of the reward due to the merits of the just.

In v. 5 the faith of the πιστεύων is not merely unquestioning acceptance of God’s revelation, but also complete surrender of self to God in love, obedience, and confidence: in view of this God gives the grace of justification. Τὸν ἄσεβῃ—is not to be referred to Abraham but to be taken generally. The justifying of the impious implies the absolute gratuitousness of divine grace.¹

- 6-8. The Psalm text (Ps. xxxi. 1-2) emphasises the gift-character of justification. The sinner has no “works” which could base a claim for God’s grace, and when he is justified, his justification must be altogether gratuitous. In

¹ The words in v. 5 (Vulgate)—*secundum propositum gratiæ Dei*—are a gloss. They are not found in any Greek MS., nor in any Greek Father: they are wanting in the Itala and the other ancient versions, and they are absent from some Vulgate MSS. They are omitted in the text of WW. They convey the same thought as 2 Tim. i. 9: οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν.

Paul’s meaning in vv. 4-5 would be clearer if he had developed the contrast between “the man that works” and “the man that does not work” in this fashion:

“To him that works his reward is not reckoned according to favour, but according to obligation. When, then, a man does not work and yet receives a reward, he receives it as an act of grace, and not in view of work done. This is what happened in the case of Abraham.”

the Psalms, therefore, as well as in the Torah, it is taught that justification is given *χωρίς ἔργων*.¹

Λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου = μακαρίζει τὸν ἄνθρωπον. In the phrases ἀρέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι, ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι and οὐ μὴ λογίσῃται ἁμαρτίαν, just as in λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην, there is implied an act of grace on God's part.

The "taking away" and "covering up" of sins is equivalent to their complete removal or remission. Nothing that is blotted out from God's sight exists.

The grace of justification is not merely the forgiveness of sin, but inner sanctification. God's grace is like the sunlight which not merely dispels the darkness, but gives warmth and new life as well.

When Paul insists on the uselessness of works for justification, and on the utter absence of all works in the sinner who receives justification, he gives no basis for the Lutheran principle, *pecca fortiter : crede fortius*; he has in view only the moment of justification—the moment in which the sinner is changed into one who is genuinely just. In the life of the Christian, as Paul will show later (ch. vi.), there is no place for sin.

(2) *Abraham was justified while yet uncircumcised.* IV, 9-12

Since the Jews might object that the Psalm-text referred only to Israel, and that, therefore, only the circumcised could receive the gratuitous justification spoken of by David, Paul goes on to show that Abraham was still uncircumcised when he received justification, and that, in fact, circumcision was for Abraham only a seal of his justification by faith.

9-12. Does David's congratulation refer to the circumcised only or does it refer also to the uncircumcised? Some verb must be here supplied. Verse 6 would suggest λέγεται; ἔστιν, ἐγένετο, and πίπτει have all been conjectured.²

Paul does not answer the question, but says, in effect, that it can be answered from the case of Abraham.

Gen. xv. records the justification of Abraham; Gen. xvii contains the divine command to circumcise (given about fourteen years later). Abraham, therefore, was still uncircumcised when he received justification. When Abraham finally received the "sign of circumcision" (*i.e.*, the sign

¹ WW. read in v. 8 : *cui non imputabit*.

² The Vulgate of v. 9 has : *in circumcissione tantum manet, an etiam in præputio*—instead of, *in circumcissione tantum an et in præputio*. A Scribe carelessly repeating the *m* of *tantum* read *tantum manet*, and then later the primitive reading *an et* was added, and our present Vulgate text resulted (*et* becoming *etiam*). WW. read : *in circumcissione, an etiam in præputio*.

which was circumcision—genitive of definition), he received it as a seal (*i.e.*, a documentation and corroboration; *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 9), of the justice which he had received on account of his faith. God does not make a covenant with a sinner, and hence the sign of the Covenant became a seal or confirmation of the justice which Abraham had already received.¹ Thus faith is more important than the works of the Law, and more important and fundamental than even circumcision itself.

In verse 11, τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ refers to τῆς πίστεως, not to τῆς δικαιοσύνης, as is clear from the phrases that follow, τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας, and τῆς ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως (δι' ἀκροβυστίας = ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ).

Believing, and being justified while still uncircumcised, Abraham was to become the model and father of all who were to be justified by faith—whether Gentiles or Jews.

The uncircumcised who receive justification are, in so far, the spiritual children of the Father of many peoples, who himself received justification through faith, just as the uncircumcised receive it. The circumcised, on the other hand, though they are the children of Abraham according to the flesh, cannot call him Father unless they walk in the footsteps of his faith.

The τοῖς in ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν, etc., is awkward, because it seems to suggest a group differing from τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον; there is only one group, and the phrase ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν, etc., marks only a special quality of “those of the circumcision.” The second τοῖς may be due to a slip on the part of Tertius.² Some commentators suspect an ancient scribal error for αὐτοῖς. The Vulgate renders the reading οὐ τοῖς. That only those who imitate his faith are Abraham's children among the circumcised, is a rebuff to Jewish boasters, and a reminder that salvation does not depend on fleshly descent. Imitation of Abraham's faith in the New Testament period implied acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah.³

According to *vv.* 9-12, then, God's providence towards Abraham had two purposes :

- (1) That he should be the Father of all the uncircumcised that would believe (*Cf.* Gal. iii. 7 ff).
- (2) That he should be the Father of the Jews who would imitate his faith, and that unbelieving Jews should have no right to call him Father.

¹ For “seal,” *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 19; John iii. 33; 2 Cor. i. 22.

² The normal construction would be ἀλλὰ καὶ στοιχοῦσιν.

³ WW. read in *v.* 12: *non his tantum qui sunt ex circumcissione sed et his qui sectantur vestigia quæ est in præputio fidei patris nostri Abrahamæ.*

Hence it is only the believing Jews who are the genuine (*i.e.*, the spiritual) children of Abraham; and believing Gentiles form with believing Jews the true Israel, the "Israel of God" (Gal. vi. 16). With this teaching should be compared Paul's doctrine of the "circumcision of heart" above (II, 29).

- (3) *The promises made to Abraham and his Seed were not to be fulfilled through the Law; they guarantee to ALL men justification by faith.* IV, 13-17.

In verses 9-12 Paul has made it clear that Abraham's real children are those who imitate his faith. He now goes on to show that the divine promises made to Abraham and his seed, had in view the spiritual, not the fleshly, posterity of Abraham, and that the heirs to the divine promises are "those who are of faith." If only "those who are of the Law" were the heirs of Abraham, faith would be useless, and the promises themselves would be made void, for the Law is practically beyond men's powers to fulfil, and it is therefore a source rather of malediction than blessing.

13. The "promise" includes all the promises made to Abraham and his posterity (Gen. xii. 7; xiii. 15; xviii. 18; xxii. 18; xxvi. 4; xxxiii. 14), but Paul has two promises especially in view:

- (a) That Abraham and his seed would receive the land of Canaan as an inheritance.
- (b) That all the nations of the earth would be blessed in Abraham, or his seed.

In Jewish theology the land of Canaan was explained Messianically, and so Paul speaks of Abraham and his seed as "heirs of the world." By the "seed" Paul means Christ (and his followers: *cf.* Gal. iii. 16), and heirship of the world is a token of the universal spread of the Messianic Kingdom of grace and truth.

The promise of universal heirship reached (*ἐγένετο* to be understood) Abraham by the justice of faith, and not through the possession, or the fulfilment, of the Mosaic Law. Similarly, the fulfilment of that promise—*i.e.*, participation in the universal Messianic Kingdom, does not depend on the Law, but on the justice of faith.

14. If only the "people of the Law" (*οἱ ἐκ νόμου*: *cf.* *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*, v. 12), *i.e.*, those who have the Mosaic Law, were to be the heirs of the world, or members of the Messianic Kingdom, it would follow that faith would be deprived of that value which, as Paul has shown, Sacred Scripture gives to it: it would become superfluous and useless. God gave

the promises to Abraham long before the time of the Law, and Abraham received the promises in virtue of his "justice of faith." Now the promises were made to Abraham and to his seed in the same fashion. Hence the justice of faith, which was for Abraham the condition and presupposition of the promises of blessing, must be, for his seed, the condition and presupposition of the fulfilment of the promises. As the giving and reception of the promises were connected with the justice of faith, and were out of all relation to the Mosaic Law, so must it be also with their fulfilment. Only those, therefore, who are justified by faith are the true heirs and children of Abraham (*cf.* Gal. iii. 7-14). The Law, therefore, gives no ground of claim to the promised blessings. Further, the inheritance promised was to be a free gift, but it cannot be at once a wage for work done, and an undeserved gift granted on account of faith.

15. Indeed it can be argued that the Law is an *obstacle* to sharing in the blessings, for the Law is a source of wrath, rather than of blessing. When the Mosaic system was established, sin, which had been an offence against the Natural Law, a sort of division of a man within himself, became a violation of a definite divine command, an immediate offence against God—treachery, disloyalty, and rebellion, against God Himself. Moreover, the Mosaic Law commanded and prohibited many things concerning which the Natural Law supplied no direction. The Mosaic Law contained (it is estimated) 248 commands, and 365 prohibitions. It was, thus, a fearfully heavy yoke, which even willing shoulders could not bear (*cf.* Acts xv. 10). The Law, therefore, "produced wrath" in two ways:

(a) It intensified the guilt of sin (*Cf.* v. 13).

(b) It increased the number of sins (*Cf.* v. 20 ; vii. 7-25).

Now obviously that which is a source of wrath cannot be a medium of blessing, and it follows that the justice attained through faith can alone guarantee the realisation of the promises.

16. Διὰ τοῦτο = "in view of all this."

ἐκ πίστεως: commentators add ἡ κληρονομία ἐστίν: but it is better to take ἐκ πίστεως as the designation of the doctrine of justification by faith, in some such way as, "Hence the 'through faith' doctrine stands." In the following clause κατὰ χάριν is most naturally taken, in analogous fashion, as a designation of the "free-gift" doctrine, which Paul has already opposed to a "wage"-theory. The sense is, then, that, in view of what has been

said, the "Through-Faith" doctrine holds good against the "Through-works-of-the-Law" Theory, and, in consequence, the κατὰ χάριν is true—as against the κατὰ μισθόν view. We can suppose γένηται with ἵνα.

God's economy generally is one of grace and favour: it is κατὰ χάριν, not κατὰ ὀφειλήμα. By making His promises independent of the possession, and the fulfilment, of the Law, and making them depend on faith and grace, God guaranteed the certainty of their realisation, and made participation in the Messianic inheritance accessible to all the seed of Abraham—whether the purely spiritual seed, or the seed that would be both physical and spiritual. It is only because a way of salvation *outside the Law* is possible, that Abraham can have a posterity in all nations, and that the promises can be really fulfilled. In the eyes of God Abraham is the "Father of us all"—i.e., of all believers (= "the whole seed"), and Christians are brethren of Isaac and children of promise.¹

17. This is the meaning of Gen. xvii. 5: "Father of many peoples (= of all) I have made thee."

Κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ = κατέναντι θεοῦ ὃ ἐπίστευσεν. Lag. refers this back to πᾶτερ παντῶν ἡμῶν—[Our Father I say] before God, etc.

In believing God Abraham believed Him Who quickens the dead, and calls the non-existent into being (1 Sam. ii. 6; Job. v. 21). If Abraham was to become the Father of many peoples, it was necessary that God should breathe new life into dead bodies (the bodies of Abraham and Sara), and that He should call the many peoples by a creative word from nothing into being (cf. Is. xlviii. 13). Lietzmann quotes the "Eighteen prayer" of the Jewish Liturgy, "Blessed be thou Yahweh, *m'haiieh hammethim*—"that makest the dead to live." There may be here in Paul the echo of a liturgical prayer: ὥς ὄντα = ὥστε εἶναι. The Vulgate *tanquam ea quæ sunt* ought to be *ac si essent*. The necessity of a creative intervention is explained in what follows.

(4) *Description of Abraham's Faith.* IV, 18-22

When Abraham was promised by God a posterity numerous as the stars of heaven, he was a childless old man—nearly a hundred years old, and Sara his wife was well beyond eighty. Yet, though he fully realised how old he was himself, and how naturally incapable of child-bearing Sara was, he wavered not at all in accepting with fullest belief the divine

¹ WW. read here: *ut secundum gratiam, ut firma sit promissio.*

message, for he knew that God had power to accomplish what He promised. This attitude of faith—which was, at the same time, an attitude of deepest reverence and submission to God—“was reckoned unto him as justice.”

18. Παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν—“against all natural probability, propped up on hope, full of hope—he believed, etc.” The oxymoron brings out the intensity of Abraham's faith. Ἐπίστευσεν is not to be read with ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, but with what follows: εἰς introduces the object of his faith—that he would be father of many peoples.¹ The Vulgate ought to be, *qui contra spem in spe, credidit se futurum esse patrem*. Though πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτόν in the sense “believing that he would be,” is perhaps without exact parallel, yet if we take πιστεύειν εἰς as equivalent to בְּאֵמִינָה the phrase very naturally expresses the thought, “believe in his becoming” (= believe that he would become).

For “thus shall thy seed be” see Gen. xv. 5. Paul quotes the end of a passage, assuming that his readers are familiar with the context.

19. When Abraham was told of the coming birth of Isaac he reflected: “Shall a son be born to a centenarian, and shall Sara, though ninety years old, bring forth?” (Gen. xvii. 17). Thus Abraham took fully into account² (κατενόησεν—not, as Vulgate has it, *nec consideravit*—a version of a less likely Lucianic text, οὐ κατενόησε) his own great age and the “deadness” of Sara's womb, and yet was not weakened in faith.

20-22. In the presence of God's promise he did not weigh the pros. and cons. (διακρίνεσθαι) unbelievingly (τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ), but grew strong in faith.³ The greater the obstacles to the fulfilment of God's promise, the more stoutly Abraham believed. The suppression of all doubt was, in itself, a giving of glory to God. Abraham was absolutely confident (πληροφορηθεῖς)⁴ that God is able to perform what He promises. His faith was thus a perfect submission of understanding and will—*plenum revelanti Deo intellectus et voluntatis obsequium* (Conc. Vatic. Const. dogm. de fide Cath., c. 3), and so intense and deep was that faith, that it was reckoned to him—out of grace—unto justice.

¹ Lag. prefers to take εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτόν as a sort of result = “so as to become”: the view in the text he regards as unlikely.

² The difficulty that after the birth of Isaac, Abraham begot six sons through Ketura is discussed in BZ xii. 168 ff; xiv. 164 ff.

³ WW.'s text here is: *et non infirmatus fide, consideravit corpus suum emortuum, cum fere centum annorum esset*.

⁴ For πληροφορέω, cf. xiv. 5; Ignatius Martyr, viii. 2. Πληροφορία occurs only in New Testament—Col. ii. 2; Heb. vi. 11; x. 22; 1 Thess. i. 5.

(5) *Abraham's Faith as a Model for Christians.* IV, 23-25

As Abraham was justified in view of his perfect faith, Christians must imitate the perfection of Abraham's faith, so as, like him, to attain to justification. As Abraham believed with perfect faith that God would fulfil His promise of giving him a numerous progeny, so we must believe with unwavering faith that Christ, our Redeemer, was raised up from the dead.

23. Οὐκ ἐγράφη δέ, etc.: The saying "It was reckoned to him" was not used in reference to Abraham merely: it is applicable also to us, for we are justified—as Abraham was—through faith. WW. omit *ad justitiam*.

- 24-25. As Abraham believed in Him Who can make the dead to live (v. 17), so we must believe in Him Who raised Jesus up from the dead—and raised Him up that He might justify us.

"For our sins" Jesus was "given up" to death—that our sins might be wiped out: and Jesus was raised up (from the dead) "for our justification"—i.e., to apply to us the grace of justification. The negative and positive sides of justification are here suggested.

Paul makes our "justification" (δικαίωσις) the aim of the Resurrection because it is πίστις ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα Ἰησοῦν, according to v. 24, that justifies us, and also, of course, because it is from the Risen Saviour at the right hand of God that the application of the grace merited on Calvary goes forth. Toletus puts it thus: *Ideo dicitur resurrexisse propter justificationem nostram, ut redemptio facta per mortem nobis applicaretur, et fructum ejus participaremus.*

Thus verse 25 cannot mean that Christ merited by His death the remission of sin, and by His Resurrection, justice and holiness—as if the Atonement were not complete on Calvary. Christ could not merit by His Resurrection—*quia in statu resurrectionis non fuit viator sed comprehensor* (Aquinas). Commentators have given various explanations of v. 25.

Some say that Paul takes the death and Resurrection of Christ as a unity—because of the negative and positive aspects of justification.

Others point out that the Resurrection of Christ is the "*causa exemplaris*" of the life of Christians.

It does seem that some sort of causal connection between the Resurrection of Christ and men's justification is actually asserted in v. 25. How is this possible in view of the completeness of the atonement on Calvary? (Heb. ix. 12; x. 12, 14).

- (a) It has been explained above that our justification is based on faith in Christ *Who died and rose from the dead*.
- (b) The Resurrection is the most powerful of all the arguments that lead men to believe in the Divinity and redemptive work of Christ (*Cf.* 1 Cor. xv).
- (c) In God's plan the Resurrection preceded the sending of the Holy Spirit (John xvi. 7) and the missionary work of the Apostles.
- (d) The Risen Christ is Head of the redeemed, and as πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν is Distributor of the graces of salvation which He merited by His sufferings and death. The Christian life is a participation in the life of the Risen Saviour.

When Paul states so emphatically that Christians, like Abraham, are justified by faith, he merely wishes to make it clear that, in the Christian period, Jews and Gentiles have access to justice through faith in Jesus Christ. He has not in view, for the moment, how that condition of justice is to be maintained throughout life. It is clear from Paul's teaching generally that faith alone without works is not sufficient for the conduct of the Christian life. The faith of a Christian must be a living faith—a faith that is active through charity (Gal. v. 6). In 1 Cor. xiii. 2, Paul says: "If I had full faith so as to move mountains, and had not charity I should be a mere nothing." There is no contrast, therefore, between the doctrine of Paul and that of James. The Epistle of James is not concerned with the factors which produce justification, but with the perils of laxity, indifference and Antinomianism, which threatened the daily lives of Christians. Paul, if he were dealing with a Christian faith which was a mere intellectual assent, and barren of active results, would condemn it no less vehemently than James. It is to be noted too that James, like Paul, makes Gen. xv. 6 the chief basis of his discussion. When Paul makes faith without works the basis of justification, and James asserts (ii. 24) that a man is justified by works, and not by faith merely, there is no contradiction, for James is speaking of works of the Christian life (= the faith active through charity, of Paul), and Paul has in view the theory that works of the Law could of themselves secure justification. Moreover, the faith that justifies according to Paul, is not merely intellectual acceptance of the divine nature and mission of Jesus, but a readiness to do all that

such an acceptance implies—a readiness, therefore, and determination to obey the commands of Jesus.

Neither Paul nor James discusses *ex professo* the question how a Christian, who has forfeited justification by sin, can again acquire it.

III. THE LIFE OF THE JUSTIFIED. V, 1-VI, 23

(a) THE FRUITS OF JUSTIFICATION. V, 1-11

Paul has shown that faith in Jesus Christ is the means to justification. He now goes on to describe the wonders of that justice which is revealed in the Gospel (i. 17). He begins by analysing the fruits of justification. These are eight:

- (i) Peace with God, *v. 1.*
- (ii) The hope of glory, *v. 2.*
- (iii) As product of that hope—gladness in tribulation, *v. 3.*
- (iv) Constancy, and arising thence, tried and tested virtue, *v. 4.*
- (v) God's love for us, *v. 5a.*
- (vi) Indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and abundance of infused virtue, *v. 5b.*
- (vii) Imputation of Christ's merits, *vv. 6-8.*
- (viii) Confident hope of salvation, and boasting in God, *vv. 9-11.*

The sixth, seventh and eighth fruits are, in a sense, modes of the fifth—ways in which the love of God makes itself manifest.

- (i) *First fruit—Peace with God—The peace which follows reconciliation. v. 1*

1. Whether we should read $\epsilon\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ or $\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ is a matter of dispute: the latter has most of the textual evidence in its favour: it is also supported by the Vulgate; but the former (an Antiochian reading) undoubtedly fits better into the context. Paul's point seems to be that we *have* peace with God through Jesus Christ. An exhortation to keep peace with God would be out of touch with the context, and, moreover, Paul has not yet begun to be exhortative. The reading $\epsilon\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, is supported by the Egyptian MSS. and it belongs to a very old and widespread tradition. It was probably due originally to an audition error of a scribe writing to dictation, for the distinction of $\omicron$ and ω had already disappeared from

ordinary speech by the New Testament period. Even Tertius, Paul's scribe (xvi. 22), as Lietzmann points out, would not have been sure from Paul's pronunciation, whether he was to write ἔχομεν or ἔχωμεν. In spite, therefore, of the very powerful text-tradition in favour of ἔχωμεν, and in spite of the support which that reading receives in the Vulgate and the Peshitta, it seems better to retain ἔχομεν as the original Pauline text because of its suitability in the context. Those who read ἔχωμεν have to give ἔχειν the sense of φυλάσσειν—and that is scarcely possible.

The peace with God is due to reconciliation. God is no longer angry with us, but gracious and fatherly. As Christians and justified the Romans can look up to God as to a Father, in love and confidence. It is Jesus Christ Who has brought about this peace with God: by Him, through faith, we have attained the grace of justification—"the grace in which we stand."

The clause τῇ πίστει is present in the Egyptian, Latin and Syriac texts: it is wanting in Bsa, DG, and the Commentary of Origen. It is probably genuine; ¹ it expresses the *causa dispositiva* of justification. As Estius says:

Recte et convenienter dicitur quod per fidem habemus accessum et ingressum ad gratiam justificationis, quomodo per ostium ingredimur domum, quamvis ipsum ostium pars domus sit.

Ἐσχήκαμεν in Hellenistic literature is equivalent to ἔχομεν. "This grace in which we stand" is the grace of justification.

(ii) *Second fruit—Hope of Glory.* v. 2

2. Καὶ καυχώμεθα, etc.

Καυχώμεθα is present indicative (cf. ἔχομεν, v. 1), as the Vulgate *gloriamur* implies.

Ἐπ' ἐλπίδι indicates rather the ground than the object of the boasting: in our confident hope of the glory of God we already boast of that glory. The glory of God is the crown and completion of the grace of justification. It is the glory in which men, as children of God and coheirs of Christ, share (cf. viii. 18). Aquinas explains: *Gloria quam habet Deus in se ipso. Et haec gloria, quæ in futuro in nobis complebitur, interim in nobis incohatur per spem* (cf. 1 Thess. ii. 12; John xvii. 22 ff.).

The Vulgate *filiorum* is according to the sense, but it does not belong to this text (see viii. 21).

The Christian can live in firm hope of salvation (cf.

¹ WW. read *fide* instead of *per fidem*.

ii. 7, 10), and he can let the whole world see his hope and confidence, and can boast of the object of his confident hope. All this is quite different from the self-boasting of the Jews (ii. 17, 20) : it is indeed not so much boasting in any sense, as *exulting* over a divine favour which Christians may confidently hope to receive.

(iii) *Third fruit—Gladness in Tribulation.* v. 3a

3a. Not merely do we boast (or exult) on account of the glory that we confidently look for, but, in the strength of grace, we boast of (or exult in) the troubles of the present life. The merely natural man is weighed down hopelessly by such troubles, but the Christian sees them in the light of Calvary, and realises their value for holiness. Instead, therefore, of depression and despair, they bring him gladness and courage. With all this should be compared viii. 17 :

“If [we are God’s] children, then [we are] also heirs, heirs of God, coheirs of Christ ; if we suffer with Christ it is only that we may be glorified with Him.”

While there the consolation in suffering is the consciousness of suffering with Christ, here the ground of boasting in affliction is the clear knowledge that suffering gives opportunity for the exercise of virtue, and thus strengthens the hope of the glory of God.

Ἐν τοῖς θλίψεσιν does not mean “in seasons of trouble,” or “in the midst of trouble.” It is of the afflictions themselves that the justified boast.

(iv) *Fourth fruit—Constancy and tried Virtue.* v. 3b-4

3b-4. This fruit is itself an outcome of the gladly borne trials of the Christian life. Notice here how the divine purpose in our sufferings is stated in a climax, in which each member resumes the idea of the preceding member.¹ Ὑπομονή (the product of θλίψις) is steadfastness, perseverance, endurance ; δοκιμή is tested virtue (1 Pet. i. 7)—the condition of one who has stood the test (in Classical Greek it = “test”). The man who steadfastly endures becomes δόκιμος.² The more steadfast we become, the more confident is our hope of glory. Thus out of that hope spring gladness on account of suffering, and steady endurance of that suffering ; and these, in turn, reinforce “the hope which inspires” them (Cf. 2 Cor. i. 3-11 ; Jas. i. 3 ; 1 Pet. i. 6 f. : and the “Beatitude” of the mourners, Matth. v. 4. Cf. also Wisd. iii. 4).

¹ Cf. for a similar use of climax, Wisd. vi. 17-19.

² Cf. Jas. i. 3.

(v) *Fifth fruit—God's Love for us.* v. 5a

5a. The hope of sharing in God's glory does not put those that hope to shame: it does not deceive, that is, by falling short of realisation. This is guaranteed by the love of God which inundates the hearts of the justified.

This love of God has often been explained as the infused theological virtue of the love of God. But it seems to be more likely that we should understand it (with Origen, Chrysostom, and most commentators) as God's love for us.¹ God's love for us is naturally a powerful guarantee of the security of hope. The love of God for us penetrates and permeates our hearts, and makes us love God on our part.

(vi) *Sixth fruit—Indwelling of the Holy Spirit.* v. 5b

5b. The love of God for us is poured out like a mighty torrent that sweeps away all doubt about the realisation of our hope of glory. It is poured out in exuberant abundance (as ἐκκέχυται implies—the perfect suggesting the constant outpouring) by the Holy Spirit Who is *in our hearts* (the preposition ἐν—not εἰς—showing that the Holy Spirit who pours out the love is in our hearts). This activity is assigned to the Holy Spirit because, as the Hypostatic expression of Absolute Love (the love with which the Father and the Son love each other), the effects of God's love *ad extra* are ascribed to Him (Aquinas, *Summa Theol.* i, Q. 39). In the phrase δοθέντος ἡμῖν the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit is conveyed.² It is the function of the Holy Spirit to complete the work of Christ (John xiv. 26; xvi. 13). In chapter viii. 9-13 we shall see how the Holy Spirit is communicated to Christians, and dwells in them as in a Temple, so that God looks down on them in love.

(vii) *Seventh fruit—Imputation to us of Christ's merits.*

vv. 6-9

6. The construction is here somewhat difficult, and a great variety of readings has arisen.

- (1) ἔτι γὰρ.
- (2) εἰς τί γὰρ.
- (3) εἰ γέ.
- (4) εἰ γὰρ.
- (5) ἥ τί γὰρ.

¹ The words of Trent., Sess. vi, cap. 7, do not exclude this view.

² Cf. Tit. iii. 5-8; 1 Cor. iii. 16; 2 Tim. i. 14.

(1) has the best MS. support ; (3) is an easier text adopted by B. The Latin versions seem to have followed (2). Against (1) is the awkward repetition of ἔτι after ἀσθενῶν—but it is repeated there, probably, to counteract the effect of the unusual position of the first ἔτι : the repetition makes more emphatic the point that Jesus died for us when we were *still* “sick” (ἀσθενεῖς = sin-sick). The “for” introduces a further reason why our hope (v. 2) is not in vain. God’s love for us, poured out in us by the indwelling Spirit of holiness, is one reason. A further reason is the manifestation of God’s love shown in the death which Christ endured for us when we were still sin-laden.

When, then, we were still “sin-sick” (ἀσθενεῖς—the opposite of δικαιωθέντες), Christ died for us κατὰ καιρὸν (at the appointed season, when the fulness of time had come : Gal. iv. 4); He died for us who were ἀσεβεῖς—impious and undeserving of His love. We had deserved death, but Christ came forward as self-offered victim on our behalf (ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν). Cf. Gal. iii. 13 ; 2 Cor. v. 14, etc.

In thus dying for sinners Christ showed a marvellous intensity of love. The depth of that love is made clearer in v. 7.

7. As the context speaks of persons rather than of things, it is better to take δικαίου and ἀγαθοῦ as masculines—meaning a just man, and a benefactor respectively. The article in τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ is practically equivalent to “his.” One will scarcely die for a just man, though, possibly, a man may decide to die for his benefactor. The Peshitta rendering, “on behalf of impious men” as representing ὑπὲρ δικαίου, is obviously an attempt to escape the obscurity of the Greek. The verse seems to combine two thoughts :

(1) Christ died for sinners—though one is scarcely ever willing to die for even a just man.

(2) Christ died for sinners, though, at the best, a man might be willing to die for his benefactor.

The Vulgate *Ut quid enim* (presupposing εἰς τί γάρ) apparently suggests the connection : “Why did Christ show such love in dying for us, if He was about to abandon us, and deceive our hopes?” This sense is good, but the reading on which it is based, is unsatisfactory.

8. On the intensity and self-sacrifice of Christ’s love we can surely base a confident hope of salvation.

God has set forth in the clearest light (συνίστησιν)¹ His

¹ The Vulgate *commendat* is not good. *In nobis* ought to be *erga nos*. WW. read *in nos*.

love for us by giving up His Son to death for us when we were *still* (ἐτι again: cf. v. 6) sinners. That is an act of love utterly outside the range of all that is thinkable in the dealings of men. Sinners who had deserved His wrath and condemnation God has rescued by the death of His own Son.¹

(viii) *Eighth fruit—Confidence of salvation and boasting in God.* vv. 9-11

9. From the ineffable intensity of such a love for *sinful* men we can surely infer with confidence that those who have been justified by the blood of Christ will also be saved by Him from God's wrath on the Day of Judgment. There is an argument *a fortiori* here: if Christ's love wrought so much for sinners, what will it not accomplish for those whom Christ has redeemed? Surely the Sacrifice of Christ will not be permitted to appear as if it had been in vain!

The "rescue from anger" is the negative aspect of attaining to glory (Cf. ii. 8, 9).

Δικαιωθέντες is in strong contrast with ἀμαρτωλῶν, and obviously cannot designate a mere forensic classification: the state of justice is not less an actual qualitative condition of the individual than the state of sin.

Paul does not say, of course, that everyone who has been justified will be saved: but he does imply that the justified are nearer to salvation than sinners are to justification. If, then, God gives justification to sinners, we, who have been justified, have the strongest grounds for hoping that we shall be saved. The justifying of a sinner implies for St. Paul a sort of creative act on God's part: it is the production of a *καινή κτίσις*: On the other hand, justification is an *inchoata gloria* which is destined, with God's help, and our co-operation, to grow steadily into the full glory of salvation. Cf. vi. 22: οὐκ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωῆν αἰώνιον.

- 10-11. When we were enemies of God through sin we were reconciled with Him by the death of His Son. Hence, now that we are made friends of God by the *death* of Christ, we shall, with all the more reason, be *saved* by His *life*. The Christian, that is, lives in the Risen Christ, and in that union with the Risen Christ he has the ground and guarantee of eternal life.

¹ The Vulgate *Secundum tempus* in v. 8 is a gloss—inserted from v. 6.

Commentators construe *v.* 11 very differently :

(a) Some supply σωθησόμεθα after οὐ μόνον δέ and take ἄλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι as predicate of καταλλαγέντες.

“Not only (shall we be saved, but reconciled) we boast of God,” etc.—i.e., the reconciliation effected by Christ makes us sure of salvation, and is the ground of our present joy, and our boasting of God’s love and care.

Against this construction it has been objected that καυχώμενοι cannot thus take the place of a finite verb. Καυχώμεθα is found as a reading—but not in the best MSS.

(b) It has also been suggested that καταλλαγέντες be understood after οὐ μόνον δέ—so that the sense would be: “Not only (are we reconciled), but we boast of God,” etc.

(c) Others connect καυχώμενοι with σωθησόμεθα and construe thus:

Not only (shall we be saved), but (we shall be saved), boasting, etc.

(d) Perhaps the most natural construction is to take 10 and 11 together thus:

“How much more shall we, as reconciled, be saved through His life, and not merely (as reconciled), but also as men that boast of God through Jesus Christ,” etc.

The Vulgate *gloriamur* may represent καυχώμενοι, or the less likely καυχώμεθα.

The “boasting” which was denied to the Jew in the preceding discussion (ii. 17 ff), is here conceded to the Christian; but it is not a boasting of the Christian’s own achievement. It is rather an exulting in the results of Christ’s redemptive work—the work of reconciliation (*cf.* iii. 25; Phil. iii. 3), and Paul now goes on to analyse those results.

(b) ADAM AND CHRIST. V, 12-21 ¹

In verses 1-11 Paul has shown that through Christ we have been reconciled with God, and given a sure hope of eternal life. He now proceeds to show the greatness of Christ’s redemptive work by contrasting the restoration made by Christ with the destruction wrought by Adam. The source of man’s ruin was one man—the head of the human race: the source of man’s restoration is also one Man—Who is the Head of all the redeemed. In verses 12-14 Paul

¹ On this section see Freundorfer, *Erbsünde und Erbtod beim Apostel Paulus* (Münster, 1927).

works out the similarities between the deeds of Adam and those of Christ; in verses 15–17 he notes the differences in the nature and outcome of their activities, and in 18–21 he summarises the details of the parallel Adam—Christ. Throughout, Paul assumes without proof that Adam is the type of Christ. The whole section, 12–21, supplies a further ground for the confidence of the Christian Hope.

(1) *Similarities between the deed of Adam and that of Christ.*
12–14

12. Διὰ τοῦτο is probably not (as Lag. and Lietzmann suggest) a mere transition phrase: it seems to point to an inference from the section, vv. 1–11, with its emphasis on the life of justification which Christ has won for us. As we have attained life through sharing in the life of the Risen Christ, we may rightly say: “As Sin and Death came upon all through one man, so Justice and Life have come to all through one Man.”

Ὡςπερ, etc.: We have here a protasis without any real apodosis: there is no οὕτως corresponding to ὥςπερ—for the οὕτως in v. 12c is not the grammatical correlate of our ὥςπερ. Though a formal apodosis is lacking, the outline of such an apodosis is suggested in v. 14—in the thought of Adam as type of Christ (ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος).¹

The lack of an apodosis is not due to carelessness on the part of Paul so much as to the multiplicity of thoughts that here surge through his mind and struggle for expression. If there were an apodosis it would be something like this:

“So now through One Man justice has come into the world, and by justice, life, and so life must pass on to all, since all are justified.” This is the Apodosis suggested by Origen (Comm. in Epistolam B. Pauli ad Rom., Lib. v. 1): it is supported by the parallel 1 Cor. xv. 22: ὥςπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται, and by verses 18–19 below.

Ἡ ἁμαρτία is Sin personified—Sin as a power that has made itself felt in the world. It is the personification of Sin as a power opposed to God—“Queen Sin,” as some commentators have called it. It includes, therefore, both original and actual sin (cf. v. 21; vi. 6, 12, 17–20, 22). This power began to exercise its influence through Adam’s fall (Gen. iii).

Εἰς τὸν κόσμον: The Vulgate *in hunc mundum* is not

¹ The summary of the parallel, Adam-Christ, in vv. 18–19 below, indicates clearly the sort of apodosis which is required by v. 12.

necessary; the "world" is earthly creation in general, and, in particular, the world of men (*cf.* iii. 6, 19; xi. 12; 1 Cor. iv. 9; 2 Cor. v. 19). With Adam's transgression Queen Sin first appeared among men.¹

Ἐισελθεῖν — "appear," "come forth,"—take its place as a personage on the world's stage.² This entering in of Sin in no way suggests the thought of the self-assertion of a hitherto latent sinful σάρξ of Adam. Paul means here simply that, just as Christ is the Author of justice and life, so Adam brought sin and death into the world: there is no hint of a supposed latent sin-element in Adam. In v. 15 it is of a special παράπτωμα of Adam that Paul speaks, and in v. 19 human sinfulness is traced back to a definite personal παρακοή of Adam. Besides, the words in v. 12, "By one man sin came into the world," can only mean that sin came into the world as something new—and not as something previously existing. Before Adam's sin, then, ἁμαρτία was not in the world—latently or otherwise.

To hold a theory of the immanent origin of sin would be to make God the immediate source of sin. Paul quite clearly thinks of a σάρξ which is *not* sinful: *cf.* Rom. viii. 3: if Christ came in our flesh, it was obviously *per se* a sinless flesh. Again, if a flesh can become (as our flesh can, according to Paul) "spiritual," it cannot be intrinsically, or metaphysically, sinful. Note in this connection the Pauline teaching that the body is for the Lord (1 Cor. vi. 13); that it is the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. vi. 19); that it can be quickened by the πνεῦμα of Jesus (Rom. viii. 11): that the members of the body can become ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ (vi. 13). Whenever Paul speaks, therefore, of the σάρξ as the seat and organ of sin, he is thinking of human flesh as it, in fact, is—infected with Adam's sin, not σάρξ as it came from the hand of God³ (*Cf.* Schauf, *Sarx. Der Begriff "Fleisch" bei dem Apostel Paulus.* Münster, 1924).

Θάνατος is, like ἁμαρτία, a personification: it is thought of as a power ruling among men. The definite reference to Gen. ii. 17; iii. 19, shows that Paul means by "death" physical death: he is arguing about something quite visible

¹ The sin of Eve is not considered because Paul is contrasting race-representative with race-representative. Elsewhere (*cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14) Paul hints that Sin had entered earlier into the spirit-world.

² *Cf.* St. John's references to the coming into the world of the Word, John i. 9 f; iii. 17, 19; vi. 14; ix. 39, etc. *Cf.* also 1 Tim. i. 15.

³ *Cf.* Wisd. i. 13 f. "Because God made not death . . . for He created all things that they might have being: And the products of the world are healthsome, and there is no poison of destruction in them, nor hath Hades any royal dominion upon earth" (Charles' Translation).

and obvious to men generally, and, therefore, about physical, not spiritual, death. It is perfectly clear that all men between Adam and Moses died—so argues Paul—and, since death is due to sin, there must have existed a sin which caused the death of all. That sin was not a personal sin of each one that died—for, throughout the period from Adam to Moses, the sanction of death was not attached to any command. The sin in question must therefore be Adam's Sin—Original Sin.

For this argument only the fact of *physical death* would be important.

It must not be supposed that, because Christ introduced spiritual life, Adam must be shown chiefly as the author of spiritual death. Insistence on spiritual death, as following from Adam's sin, would not help Paul's argument. But the fact of universal physical death is something that can be observed, and, in itself, it shows the universal reach of Adam's Sin: from the universality of death throughout a period in which there was no command to which the sanction of death was attached, it can be inferred that that universality is due to the sinning of all in Adam, and that the Kingdoms of Sin and Death were coextensive.

Καὶ οὕτως: This cannot introduce the apodosis to ὥστερ, etc. As introduction to an apodosis we should expect rather, οὕτως καὶ (cf. verses 15, 18, 19, 21). Paul is explaining why sin—and through sin, death—entered the world by one man: it is *because* (ἐφ' ᾧ) all sinned through that man. Καὶ οὕτως is thus a sort of consecutive expression (Cornely).

The sequence of thought is:

διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας (τῆς δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου)
ὁ θάνατος (εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν).

From this follows the inference (καὶ οὕτως):

ὁ θάνατος εἰς πάντας διῆλθεν διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀπάντων
(= ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον).

There is a causal connection between Sin and Death, and, therefore, the sin of all must lead to the death of all. The universality of death is explained by the universality of Sin (ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον).

That ἐφ' ᾧ is to be rendered here "because," is widely accepted by Catholic commentators. The Vulgate rendering *in quo* seems to take ᾧ as a relative referring back to ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου. In Phil. iii. 12, ἐφ' ᾧ is again rendered *in quo*: in Phil. iv. 10, ἐφ' ᾧ is rendered in the Vulgate by *sicut*, and in 1 Cor. v. 5 by *eo quod*. It might possibly be argued, in view of 1 Cor. v. 5, that *in quo* both in Rom. v. 12 and in

Phil. iii. 12, means really *in eo quod* (i.e., "because").¹ Though the Vulgate *in quo*, understood as a reference to the *unum hominem*, is an incorrect rendering of ἐφ' ᾧ (which normally means "because"), the doctrine that all men sinned in Adam is genuinely Pauline, and is implied in the present context.

Many modern Protestant commentators take ᾧ as a relative referring to θάνατος, and give ἐφ' ᾧ the meaning "towards which," or, "in reference to which." This sense, however, would be better conveyed by εἰς ὃν or πρὸς ὃν.

The rendering, "in which circumstances" has also been suggested for ἐφ' ᾧ.

But ἐφ' ᾧ has certainly to be taken conjunctionally as equivalent to ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι—"for the reason that." It is grammatically impossible to refer ᾧ back across three intervening thoughts, and two masculine nouns (κόσμος and θάνατος) to ἀνθρώπος. If Paul had meant "in whom" he would have written ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν ἐξ ἐκείνου ἐφ' ᾧ. Furthermore, ἐπὶ could not mean "in" in such a collective sense as we have here: if Paul had meant *in* he would have written ἐν—as he puts it in 1 Cor. xv. 22: ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν.

Ἀμαρτάνειν ἐπὶ τινι could not mean sin *in* somebody.

Ἡμαρτον—ἀμαρτάνειν always means to commit sin, never "to become sinful": this latter idea is conveyed in v. 19 by ἀμαρτωλὸν καθίστασθαι. Hence πάντες ἡμαρτον cannot mean "all were in the condition of sin," but simply "all sinned."

The question now arises: Is the sin of all (πάντες ἡμαρτον), which is alleged as the ground of the death of all, the *individual* sin of each several one, or the *collective* sin of all in the father of the race? To put the question differently: Does πάντες ἡμαρτον refer to the universality of actual sin described above in I, 18-III, 20, or does Paul mean that death passed on to all because all once sinned together in the Adamitic sin?

The Council of Trent makes it clear that the πάντες ἡμαρτον is to be taken as referring to the sin of Adam as Head of the human race—Original Sin (see Trent: Sess V, *Decretum de peccato originali*), and this is the only explanation that harmonises with the context. Unless Paul is thinking of the death of all as due to a participation of all in the sin of one, there is no point in comparing the Life of all that springs from One with the death of all that came through *one*.

When Paul says, in v. 14, that, in the interval between Adam and Moses, death ruled even over those who did not sin like Adam—i.e., who did not violate a divine command

¹ The Peshitta definitely takes ἐφ' ᾧ as = "because" in the present passage.

to which was attached the sanction of death, the implication must be that their death was due to Adam's sin, and not to their own actual sins—particularly as many of those who died in the period between Adam and Moses committed no personal sin—such as children who died before attaining the use of reason. Throughout that period, in which no new Code of Law was enacted, men did of course sin, yet out of their actual sin in itself death did not come, for sin was not then imputed unto death. In any case, the death of children and others, who died without having contracted personal sin, inevitably pointed to a sin which was not, in the personal sense, their own. If then, the individual sins of men between Adam and Moses did not cause their death—because there was then no Law binding with sanction of death, and because some died innocent of actual sin, it is clear that the universality of sin (πάντες ἥμαρτον) which caused the universality of death in the pre-Mosaic period, consisted in the share of all in Adam's sin.

The general argument of verses 12-14 runs thus :

Sin is not imputed [to death] where there is no Law [with sanction of death]:

But all men were punished with death between Adam and Moses [though, in that period they violated no Law that had death-sanction].

Hence, as death comes through sin, all men died because, by one man's sin, they had all sinned.

13. Ἀμαρτία οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου does not mean that God did not impute sin to men in the pre-Mosaic period—for that would be opposed to ii. 12, but that the sin is not imputed unto death, in the absence of a positive Law threatening death.¹ From the sanction of death established in Paradise (Gen. ii. 17) until the time of Moses, no divine death-sanction was instituted. Hence all death in that period must be referred back to the earlier sanction of death, and death in the period Adam to Moses must, therefore, be due to the Sin of Adam.²

¹ WW. read : *non imputatur, cum lex non est*. The reference is rather to a principle, than to events of history.

² The difficulty that Paul ignores here the threat of death for the crime of homicide in Gen. ix. 5 may be solved by recognising the highly Rabbinical character of Paul's reasoning in this context. For Rabbinical Theology the Mosaic Law alone was the only authority after the Adamitic period which could establish an universally binding sanction of death for sin. Speaking from this Rabbinical standpoint Paul could say : In a period in which the Mosaic Law did not exist, Gen. ii. 17, alone could give the basis of a death-sanction.

On the meaning of ἐλλογεῖται see Cornely, *ad loc.* : see also article by Wikenhauser in BZ. viii, 272, and Deissmann LO² 55. The word here implies more than to debit, or to record something against an individual. It must mean to be imputed unto death. The variants ἐνελογεῖτο and ἐλογεῖτο are poorly supported.

14. Here is emphasised the rule of Death from Adam to Moses : throughout that period Death ruled as a king. That rule of Death implies that all men sinned in, and with, Adam—according to their nature. It is only on this supposition that the death of children prior to the use of reason in the period from Adam to Moses can be explained ; they certainly had not transgressed after the manner of Adam—by an actual sin of disobedience against a command enforced by death-sanction. Yet, nevertheless, they had to endure the penalty of sin, and, therefore, they must have sinned in Adam.

The μή in τοὺς μή ἁμαρτήσαντες was not represented in many Pre-Jeromite Latin MSS., and was regarded with suspicion by Origen ; it is, however, supported by practically all Greek MSS.

Most mediæval commentators, following Augustine, understood those who did not sin like Adam as children who had died before they were capable of committing actual sin. In this view the sense of the passage would be that Death ruled in the period Adam to Moses, though no sin threatened with death could have been committed in that period, and it ruled, moreover, even over those who had committed no personal sin of any kind. Death ruled in the Adam to Moses period, therefore, not because of the sins of individuals (so that πάντες ἥμαρτον of v. 12 cannot be explained of actual sins of individuals) but because all had sinned in the father of the human race. The παράβασις Ἀδάμ was a πάντες ἥμαρτον. Paul does not explain precisely how all shared in Adam's sin, but the active force of ἥμαρτον (see above on v. 12) shows that for Paul the physical and moral union of Adam with his posterity was so intimate, that the sin of Adam involved a sinning (πάντες ἥμαρτον) of all men.

Ὅς ἐστὶν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος suggests the apodosis to v. 12 : Adam is *per contrarium* a type of " the Future One." Paul has shown what ruin and destruction was wrought by Adam's sin ; and, if Adam is the " type " of Christ, it must be in the sense, that, as Adam was the author of destruction and death, Christ is the Author of blessing and life. As Adam, the physical father of the race became for all (without their personal sin) the cause of sin and death, so Christ in the supernatural order, as the Father of a new race, has become for all (without merit of theirs) the Author of justice and life. This typology by contrast is worked out in the following verses.

That Christ is the Antitype of Adam is a central point of Pauline theology : It is here accepted as something of itself

obvious. The same doctrine is stated clearly also in 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45-49. In 1 Cor. xv. 45-49 Christ is called the second (or final) Adam; and when the first Adam is here called *τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος*, we should probably understand Ἀδάμ with τοῦ μέλλοντος—"who is the type of the future Adam."¹

(2) *Differences between the Deed of Adam and the Work of Christ.* 15-17

15. There is greater efficacy in the χάρισμα for good, than in the παράπτωμα for evil. The redemptive work of Christ is called a χάρισμα to emphasise its gift-character. The χάρισμα is also called here, ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ, and ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The "grace of God" is the gracious mercy with which God decreed the Redemption: the δωρεὰ is the grace merited by the God-Man, Jesus—the grace of justice. Read ἐν χάριτι with δωρεὰ—the gift which consisted in the grace merited by Jesus.

(i) The first difference. The forces at work.

While both the παράπτωμα and the χάρισμα are each the work of *one man*, the agents really belong to totally different orders. On the one side is the sin of a man; on the other a deed of grace and blessing wrought by a God-Man.

Again, the sin was a source of evil and misfortune only, while the gracious deed of Christ was a source of divinely-planned blessing. That blessing must, then, as greatly transcend the evil results of Adam's Sin, as the divine transcends the human.

If—as is the case (εἰ does not imply doubt, but rather the contrary, as in John xiii. 14 : cf. Acts xi. 17 ; 1 Cor. ix. 11)—the sin of a man had such an effect for all, the gracious work of Redemption wrought by a God-Man will be effective for all in a still more abundant fashion. The work of God is

¹ In Gen. ii. 17, and iii. 19, death appears as the punishment of Adam's sin. Death, therefore, came into the world as the wages of sin. Compare the clear passage in Wisdom ii. 23-34. Similar thoughts are found in Ecclesiasticus xxv. 24 ; Ps. li. 7 ; Job. xiv. 4 ; and in 4 Esra. iii. 7 ; vii. 118, and in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch i., 23, 4. That men's sinfulness generally is connected with Adam's Fall is implied in 4 Esra. iii. 21-22, 26 ; iv. 30 f ; vii. 11. (See Bousset, *Judentum*, 2nd. Ed., 466 ff.) In spite of the apparent suggestiveness of the texts in 4 Esra., Apocalypse of Baruch, etc., it must be maintained that Paul did not derive the doctrine of Original Sin from Rabbinical Theology. Jewish Theology recognised the connection of death with Adam's sin ; but it knew nothing of an Original Sin transmitted to all. Even the Old Testament texts in this connection would have in themselves little definite meaning apart from the accomplishment of redemption by Our Lord—apart, that is, from the New Testament. See the *Excursus* in Lag. *Note sur Saint Paul et le péché originel*—following ch. v ; and see the thoroughgoing discussion of the whole question in Freudentorfer, *Erbünde*, ch. i and ii.

always productive in a manner immeasurably superior to that of men; and for Paul the beneficent activity of God has always the peculiar characteristic of superabundance (hence ἐπερίσσευσεν). The phrase πολλῷ μᾶλλον seems to emphasise the greater certainty, and permanence of the effect of Christ's work, as well as its superabundance.

Chrysostom explains the comparison in *v.* 15 thus: Εἰ ἡ ἁμαρτία τοσοῦτον ἴσχυσε, καὶ ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτία ἐνός χάρις, καὶ θεοῦ χάρις, καὶ οὐ Πατρὸς μόνου, ἀλλὰ καὶ Υἱοῦ, πῶς οὐ περιέσται μειζόνως;

In verse 15 οἱ πολλοί and τοὺς πολλούς = "all"—as is clear from the whole context (*cf.* *vv.* 12, 18). The Vulgate has *multi* in the first place, and *plures* in the second. Paul says οἱ πολλοί instead of πάντες to bring out more strongly the contrast with εἰς (*cf.* the contrasts in *vv.* 18 and 19 below: *cf.* also 1 Cor. x. 17).

(ii) Second difference. Dissimilarity of effects.

16. The Vulgate has *non sicut per unum peccatum ita et donum*¹—where the sense of the Greek is: "And the gift is not as [the offence committed] by *one man who sinned*."

The first point in the difference of the effects of Adam's Sin and Christ's redemptive work is that, while Adam committed one sin, which incurred the penalty of death for him and all his posterity, the redemption wrought by Christ atoned, not merely for that one sin of Adam, but for all the actual individual sins of all men.

Paul says that the κρίμα ἐξ ἐνός led to κατὰ κρίμα—that is, that God's judgment on the one Sin led to the application of that judgment (κατὰ κρίμα) to those who incur it. The κρίμα is God's condemnation of Adam's Sin: the κατὰ κρίμα is the condemnation to death which followed the judgment of condemnation.²

On the other hand, the χάρισμα (which here includes the δώρημα) is concerned not merely with the transgression of Adam, but also with "many (*i.e.*, all) transgressions"; the Atonement of Christ is therefore indefinitely wider in its

¹ WW. read: *per unum peccantem*. They omit *quidem*.

² It has been maintained by the majority of recent Catholic commentators that in τὸ κρίμα ἐξ ἐνός we must take ἐνός as masculine on account of the immediately preceding δι' ἐνός ἁμαρτήσαντος—in spite of the immediately following, and apparently parallel, ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων, and in spite also of *v.* 18, δι' ἐνός παραπτώματος. If ἐνός is to be taken as masculine, rather than as neuter, the sense of τὸ κρίμα ἐξ ἐνός εἰς κατὰ κρίμα must be, "The judgment (pronounced against Adam) developed because of one (Adam) into a κατὰ κρίμα for all."

Whether, then, ἐνός is taken as masculine or as neuter, the sense is practically the same. In the following verse 17, we have τῷ τοῦ ἐνός παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἐνός, while in *v.* 18 we have δι' ἐνός παραπτώματος.

reach than the transgression of Adam. *Quanto aliquid est potentius tanto magis se potest ad multa extendere* (Aquinas).

Further, while the Sin of Adam led to condemnation to death (κατάκριμα) for all men, the gift of Christ leads to δικαίωμα—justification (in the sense of objective justification = “justifying”). “It (leads) from many transgressions unto justifying”; δικαίωμα (instead of δικαίωσις) is probably used because of the assonance with κατάκριμα. Not only has the grace-gift of Redemption wiped away all sins, but it has produced justification.

The contrasts in *v.* 16 should be carefully noted.

(1) τὸ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνός (= τὸ κρίμα τὸ ἐξ ἑνός),
contrasted with

τὸ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων.

(2) κατάκριμα resulting from κρίμα,
contrasted with

δικαίωμα resulting from χάρισμα (= δώρημα).

The preposition ἐκ seems to be used in two senses: (*a*) to express causality, and (*b*) to denote mere sequence or transition from one state to another.

Chrysostom is here again as succinct and clear as on the preceding point of difference between the effects of Adam's Sin and Christ's work:

“He (Paul) said previously: If the sin of one brought death to all, much more shall the grace of One avail to save. After this he showed that, not merely was that sin taken away by grace—but that all other sins were taken away as well, and that, not merely were the sins taken away, but justice was imparted; and that Christ had brought advantage not merely proportionate to the ruin wrought by Adam—but far greater.”

(iii) Third point of difference.

17. Verse 17 puts forward another point in which the effect of Redemption contrasts with that of Adam's Sin. Adam's Sin established the rule of Death; but the Redemption has made the justified to reign in life—by their entrance into eternal life which through grace they already have achieved (grace = incipient glory).

Εἰ γὰρ, etc.: The εἰ does not suggest doubt any more than in *v.* 15. This third point of difference is partly intended to prove the ἐπερίσσευσεν clause of *v.* 15: hence the γὰρ.

Τῷ . . . παραπτώματι is instrumental dative. Death (personified) used the Sin of Adam to establish itself as King

(ἐβασίλευσεν = reigned as king). The *one* man who sinned is here again put in contrast with the *One Jesus Christ*. The repetition of τοῦ ἐνός after ἐβασίλευσεν is for the sake of emphasis—through the one man, Adam, and not through the personal sins of his posterity, did Death enter as ruler into the world.

πολλῶ μᾶλλον is used here as in *v.* 15.

In the second half of *v.* 17 one would expect a completion of the parallelism in some such form as :

πολλῶ μᾶλλον τῷ τοῦ ἐνός δικαιώματι ἢ ζωῇ βασιλεύσει
διὰ τοῦ ἐνός Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

But instead of saying that Life reigns through the work of Jesus Christ, Paul makes the recipients of redemption to reign in life through Jesus Christ—thus abandoning the exact parallelism.

In the pre-Redemption period Death had ruled over men because men were under slavery to sin. The slavery of Sin and Death has now been abolished, and they who were slaves under King Death are now rulers themselves. Life ruling over men in place of death, would be a bizarre and somewhat unintelligible idea, and Paul avoids it by making the former slaves of death royal rulers in a new life—the life, that is, of the justified. Those who have received justice share in the royal rule of the Risen Christ by sharing in His life (*cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 3 ; 2 Tim. ii. 12). Hence Paul puts away all suggestion of every kind of slavery from the life of the justified,¹ and makes that life itself a sort of kingly rule, a co-reigning with Christ (*Cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 8 ; Apoc. xx. 4 ; xxii. 5). It is implied here, and frequently elsewhere in Paul, that eternal life is as surely rooted in justification as death is in sin.

The “abundance of the grace and of the gift of justice” refers back to the thought of *v.* 15.

Chrysostom says, analysing this “abundance”: “(Paul) did not say here “grace” but “abundance of grace.” For we have not received from that grace merely as much as suffices for the taking away of sin, but much more. For we also have been freed from punishment, and have put off all iniquity, and we have been born again, and have risen again—our old man being buried ; and we have been redeemed and made holy and received into the adoption of sons, and justified, and have become brothers of the Only Begotten, and have been made coheirs with Him, and of one body with Him, and have been united to Him as the body and Head are united. All

¹ The tense ἐβασίλευσεν implies that the rule of death is over.

these things Paul called *the abundance of grace*, showing that we have not only received a cure sufficient for our wound, but also health, and beauty, and honour, and glory, and dignities which greatly transcend our nature."

For περισσεία, cf. 2 Cor. viii. 2 ; x. 15. This superabundance of grace and dignity secured by Redemption indefinitely outweighs the evil wrought by Adam. It is, says Chrysostom, as if a debtor who owed a man ten obols were cast into prison—together with his wife and children and servants, because of the debt, and a third party came forward, and paid out for the debtor, not merely ten obols but 10,000 talents, and then led the debtor out from prison into a royal palace, and set him on a kingly throne and made him a sharer in the highest honour. "Christ," says Chrysostom, "paid for us far more than we owed—as much more as is the difference between the mighty ocean and a tiny drop of water."

(3) *Summary of the parallels between Adam and Christ.*

18-21

Paul here resumes by means of distinctive phrases and expressions the points of the comparison between Adam and Christ.

18. Ἀρα οὖν, etc.: In v. 16 we have the phrase τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατὰκριμα, and the contrasted statement, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτώματων εἰς δικαίωμα. In verse 17 these two phrases are explained, and now Paul proceeds to sum up:

As then the principle, "Through the transgression of one unto all men unto condemnation" holds good, so does the other principle: "Through the just deed of one unto all men unto justification of life."

Some verb—such a ἐγένετο or ἀνέβη, should be understood in the first statement, and some similar verb in the present or future tense in the second.

As contrasted with παράπτωμα, δικαίωμα must here mean a just action. That just action is the sacrificial death of Christ. Note how "all" takes the place of the "many" of v. 15, etc.

Δικαίωσις ζωῆς is a justification that produces life, or ends in life ; or a justification which is life (either δικαίωσιν ζωοποιόν or δικαίωσιν ἧτις ἐστὶν ζωή). The "Life" is that in which, according to v. 17, the justified rule as kings (eternal life. Cf. v. 21 below).

19. Paul here elucidates v. 18—explaining the meaning of παράπτωμα and δικαίωμα, and of κατὰκριμα and δικαίωσις ζωῆς.

The παράπτωμα is Adam's παρακοή—or sin of disobedience: opposed to it is the ὑπακοή, the obedience, of Christ (= the δικαίωμα; for, Christ as ὑπῆκοος, cf. Phil. ii. 8; Gal. iv. 4).

The κατὰκριμα is elucidated by ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί and the δικαίωσις ζωῆς by δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί.

Καθιστάναι does not indicate a mere forensic or juristic result.¹ As men were actually made sinners by Adam's disobedience, so they are made just by Christ's obedience. When Paul says that *all* are made just by Christ's death, he does not imply that each individual human being is actually justified through the death of Christ. It is to be remembered that Paul is here making a contrast, and Aquinas succinctly explains the contrast thus: *Sicut nullus moritur nisi per peccatum Adæ, ita nullus justificatur nisi per justitiam Christi*. Augustine (*Contra. Julian. Lib. vi., c. 4*) makes the same point: *Ideo autem, et ibi omnes et hic omnes, quia nemo ad mortem nisi per illum, nemo ad vitam nisi per istum*.

The future κατασταθήσονται does not imply that the justification is purely eschatological, but that it is a process which goes on continuously among men. There may be in the future tense, also the hint of an eschatological aspect—a hint, that is, of the official manifestation of the just at the Great Judgment.

20-21. Paul here answers a question which very naturally suggests itself: What part did the Mosaic Law play in the period from Adam to Christ? In v. 14 he had discussed the situation as it was in the period from Adam to Moses; he now has to examine how the coming of the Mosaic Law affected that situation. Verses 20 and 21 are, thus, a sort of appendix to the section 12-19.

20. Νόμος δὲ παρεῖσθ' ἔλθεν, etc.: Παρεῖσθ' ἔλθεν is not correctly rendered by the Vulgate *subintravit*, for it does not suggest stealthy entrance. The Law was very publicly given. The word brings us back to εἰσῆλθεν of v. 12, and it means that the Law (*i.e.*, the Mosaic Law) came on the world's stage to play its part. The ἵνα clause expresses either the result or the purpose of the Law's coming. Both Chrysostom and Aquinas favour the former meaning. Many commentators find a definite design of God expressed in the ἵνα clause—not in the sense that God aimed at the increase of sin, but in the sense that the increase of sin would drive sinners to look for pardon. The difficulty here is similar to that in

¹ See the valuable discussion on the sense of καθίστασθαι in Freundorfer, *Erbssünde*, pp. 261 f.

Gal. iii. 19, and it seems better in solving it to abstract from God's purpose in giving the Law. Paul is concerned here with the Law *considered in itself simply*, as a system of commands and prohibitions. Considered in this way the inevitable result—and in a sense, therefore, the purpose—of the Law, was to increase the number of sins, and to intensify the guilt of sin. This will be made clear by Paul in chapter vii. But the purpose of God in giving the Law—as distinct from what one might call the purpose of the Law as personified—could not have been to produce increase of sin. In giving the Law God gave something which in itself was holy and good (vii. 12). The Law was designed to preserve the chosen people from the idolatry and the immorality of the surrounding heathen peoples, and thus to maintain the tradition of genuine Monotheism and the Messianic Hope. It was meant also to be for individual Israelites a divinely authoritative guide to justice and life.

But the Mosaic Law as a system of commands and prohibitions which, unlike the Gospel, communicated to men no special help for its observance, caused the increase, rather than the disappearance, of sin. It intensified the guilt of sin by making clear the malice of sin as a violation of God's command; and its many precepts were so many fresh challenges, as it were, to the concupiscence of vitiated human nature. Thus the publication of the Law made sin abound; but this was not really due to the Law itself, but to men's disorderly concupiscence. God, of course, in giving the Law, knew that through it sin would abound, but He permitted this more or less inevitable result of the working of psychological laws, that men might learn from the terrible sway of sin how helplessly weak they were themselves, and that they might thus be brought to implore divine help and rescue. Thus God's aim in giving the Law was not to make sin abound, but to lead men through their experience of the power of sin to cast themselves on His protection.¹

The Παράπτωμα of v. 20 is actual sin committed under the Law—not, as in vv. 15, 16, 17, 18, the Sin of Adam.

Οὕτως δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν, etc.: When the burden of sin bore too heavily on men, their hearts opened to grace, and a most abundant stream of grace poured down on them.

Ὑπερπερισσεύω = most richly abound: where sin abounded grace most richly abounded (not merely "superabounded").

¹ Cf. Augustine on Psalm 102: *Ideo lex data est ut crescente peccato humiliarentur superbi, superbi humiliati confiterentur, confessi sanarentur. Non crudeliter hoc fecit Deus, sed consilio medicinæ . . . augetur morbus, crescit malitia, quaeritur medicus et totum sanatur.*

21. Grace, as it were, takes the Sceptre from the hands of Sin (ἡμαρτία = "Queen Sin"), so that, as Sin had reigned by producing death,¹ Grace now reigns "by justice unto eternal life" (*i.e.*, by producing justification which leads to eternal life). And all this has been the work of Our Lord Jesus Christ.²

Verse 21 repeats the leading thoughts of the whole section, *vv.* 12-19.

The antitheses which appear throughout *vv.* 12-21 should be carefully noted. There is first the antithesis of Adam and Christ (12-14). In 15 the παράπτωμα of Adam is set over against the χάρισμα of Christ. In *v.* 16 we have contrasted the κρίμα which leads to the κατὰ κρίμα with the χάρισμα which leads to the δικαίωμα. In *v.* 17 the reign of Death, established by Adam's sin, is contrasted with the reign in life of those who have received justice. In *v.* 18 the sinful deed of an individual, which brings chastisement, is contrasted with the just deed of an individual, which brings justification. In *v.* 19 the disobedience which makes men sinners is contrasted with the obedience which makes men just. In *vv.* 20-21 we have, on the one hand Queen Sin, helped by actual sins, ruling over men by death; and, on the other, we have Grace, reigning through justice, and preparing men for eternal life (Lag.).

(c) NO PLACE FOR SIN IN THE LIFE OF THE JUSTIFIED.
VI, 1-23

In the preceding discussion Paul has shown that the increase of sin under the Law has led to an immensely abundant outpouring of grace: "Where sin abounded grace has most richly abounded." Now if this is true, may it not be inferred that men should continue in sin so that grace may be poured out abundantly? The absurdity of such an inference Paul proceeds to show from the character of the new supernatural life of the justified. In entering that life men died to sin, and with that life, therefore, sin is utterly incompatible. The new life is a participation in the life of the Risen Christ. The justified have been rescued from the slavery of sin by Christ, and a relapse into that slavery would be a turning back from life to death.

¹ WW. read: *in morte*.

² Death has not yet been fully overcome by Christ's work, for Christians must endure bodily death (1 Thess. iv. 15): but for Paul death is a prelude to a transformation (πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγούμεθα: 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52), a mere transition-stage which implies no lasting rule of Death. In the General Resurrection the power of Death will be completely overthrown (1 Cor. xv. 54-57).

(1) *Dying with Christ in Baptism.* VI, 1-7

1. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν : We have the same kind of dialectical transition here as previously. If increase of sin brings outpouring of grace, why not remain in sin for the sake of that outpouring ? The objection is based on *v.* 20. It resembles the difficulty in *iii.* 5-8.

Ἐπιμένωμεν is deliberative conjunctive (*permaneamus* would be better in the Vulgate). Ἀμαρτίᾳ here is not original sin—since the context deals with those who are justified. Some commentators regard it as that disorderly concupiscence which can be called sin, as Trent says, *quia ex peccato est, et ad peccatum inclinatur* (as in *v.* 12 below). Others regard “Sin” here as Sin personified—the power which stirs up in men their indwelling concupiscence to sinful action.

Ἐπιμένειν ἀμαρτίᾳ = remain attached to sin, hold fast to sin (not precisely *permanere in peccato*).

The objection which Paul here puts to himself is not merely dialectical. It might seem to many a Christian who had cast off the Jewish yoke, and embraced the “freedom of Christ,” that the system of Grace demanded unfettered freedom. Where God’s grace was so abundantly present, why worry about sinning ? The grace of God would be always at hand to set things right ! This theory of Libertinism was not unknown in the early Church.

2. Μὴ γένοιτο : Paul rejects the thought, and proceeds to show that sinning is as much opposed to the genuine profession of Christianity, as is death to life.

Οἵτινες = *quippe qui* (Vulgate has *qui enim*). Ζήσομεν is better than ζήσωμεν. We have died to sin, how shall we then live in it ?

Ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ = died in respect of sin, died for sin (not “died through sin”). The aorist points to a single occurrence : when and how it took place is explained in what follows : ἀμαρτίᾳ is here *dativus incommodi*. “How shall we still live in it ?” contests not physical, but (primarily) moral possibility. To live in sin is to live in alliance, or intimate union, with sin. As Toletus puts it : *Mori alicui est opera illius abicere, vivere vero est ejus opera exercere*. To die to sin is to break with it as completely as one breaks with something through death—to have no further relations with it. As an earthly power has no authority over the dead, so Sin has no authority over the Christian. Paul is thinking here, of course, of the genuine Christian, whose life is in harmony with his beliefs. A Christian who lives in sin is not a real Christian in Paul’s eyes (2 Cor. xiii. 5).

3. Ἦ ἀγνοεῖτε, etc. : Βαπτίζειν here includes the idea of

immersion. When the candidate for baptism was totally immersed (according to the ancient custom) in the baptismal water, he was symbolically drowned and buried, and thus the baptismal rite was a symbol of the death and burial of Jesus. The coming forth from the water was a symbol of the Resurrection of Christ. And hence, as Aquinas says: *Quia sacramenta id quod significant efficiunt, ideo baptismus producit in nobis effectus mortis et resurrectionis Christi*. Chrysostom says: "What the cross and the tomb were for Christ, Baptism has become for us."

To be baptised into Christ (εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, not *in Christo Jesu*, but *in Christum Jesum*) is to be baptised into community of life and grace with Him. "Unto His death" means—so as to die His death, or to die as He died.

The community of life with Jesus into which men are baptised is the *Unio mystica*. That union is not a mere harmony of mind and will with Christ, but a real union which the Sacrament of Baptism produces. In virtue of that union the baptised are really "in Christ" (Cf. viii. 1; 1 Cor. i. 30; xii. 13; Eph. v. 30; Gal. iii. 27; John xv. 1 ff, etc.)

Being baptised into the death (εἰς θάνατον—not *in morte*) of Christ, implies that the baptised are really dead to sin through the union with the dying Christ effected *ex opere operato* by Baptism.

The manner in which Paul puts the question in *v.* 3 suggests that the idea of the mystic death and resurrection of the baptised was a familiar feature of the Christian teaching of the time. This is borne out by Col. ii. 12; iii. 1-3; 1 Pet. iv. 1 f, etc. It is to be noted, of course, that dying with Christ, being buried with Him, and being raised up with Him are merely different aspects of one event. In fact, they all occur together in the infusion of sanctifying grace Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 11.

4. Συνετάφημεν οὖν, etc.¹ It seems best to take εἰς τὸν θάνατον immediately with διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος (not with συνετάφημεν). Possibly αὐτοῦ should be supplied after θανάτου from *v.* 3. The sense would be, then, that we have been buried with Him through the baptism-unto-death,² or through the baptism-unto-His-death.

After death and burial we rise up, like Christ, to a new life—to walk in a new life. Christ was raised up from the dead "by the glory of the Father"—*i.e.*, by the glorious power, the omnipotence, of the Father (Cf. Col. ii. 11 f).

¹ The Vulgate reads: *Consepulti enim*: but οὖν is the correct reading.

² "Through death-bringing baptism"—as it were. If Paul had written διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τοῦ εἰς τὸν θάνατον, the sense would have been clearer.

In raising Christ from the dead the glory and majesty of God were most strikingly manifested (*Cf.* John xi. 40).¹ The "glory of the Father" may also be intended here to suggest the glory to which Christ returned by His Resurrection, and the "glory" of the Christian life (*cf.* ii. 7-10; viii. 19; ix. 23, etc.) as a participation in the life of the Risen Christ.²

As Christ was raised up to a glorious life, so we, too, have been raised up by baptism from the death of sin to an utterly new life ("newness of life" is stronger than "new life"), which is to be lived ("that we may walk about" = that we may "live," or, "conduct ourselves") in union with the Risen or Pneumatic Christ. In that new life the problem of conduct (περιπατήσωμεν) continues, for, though Sin has no longer a royal or tyrannical power over the justified, disorderly concupiscence still remains, and has to be kept in subjection (Gal. v. 16-17; Col. iii. 5 ff); and there is the possibility of relapse into the death of sin. This excludes every theory that tends to ascribe a "magical" or "quasi-magical" effect to the Sacrament of Baptism.

5. Εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι, etc.: σύμφυτοι does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament; it is to be regarded as derived from συμφύειν—not (as Vulgate, *complantati*, implies) from συμφυτεύειν: the word does not mean "engrafted," but "grown together into one."³ Probably αὐτῷ (or τῷ Χριστῷ) should be supplied—"grown together with Him." We have become His associates τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ—i.e., "by a death like His," or "by the 'copy,' or 'image' (i.e., Baptism in its aspect of immersion) of His death." τῷ ὁμοιώματι is an instrumental dative.

Some commentators read ὁμοιώματι with σύμφυτοι—"grown together to a death like His" (So Chrysostom, Aquinas, Estius, Lietzmann, etc.: *cf.* Vulgate), but this, though it is the grouping that immediately suggests itself, seems less reasonable than the construction above accepted.

Having become associates of Christ by a death like His, or by the copy of His death (= Baptism), it follows that we shall be the associates of Christ also by a Resurrection like His, or by the "copy" of His Resurrection (i.e., Baptism in its aspect of emergence from the baptismal water): τῷ ὁμοιώματι is to be understood in the second half of the verse, for ἀναστάσεως cannot be made to depend on σύμφυτοι.

¹ Aquinas explains: *Per virtutem Patris ex qua ipse Pater glorificatur.*

² For the "new man"—the baptised who "walks in the newness of life," see also Eph. iv. 24, and Col. iii. 20.

³ So as to have the same vital principle (Prat.)

The future ἐσόμεθα does not imply that we are not already associated with Christ through a Resurrection like His. It is the future of logical inference—both antecedent and consequent referring to what happens in Baptism: If it is certain—as it is—that we are made associates (one) with Christ by a death like His, it is equally certain that we are made one with Him by a Resurrection like His. The Resurrection referred to is that which takes place in Baptism—not, as some commentators assert—the General Resurrection. The use of the future (ἐσόμεθα) may, however, be due, to some extent, to Paul's desire to suggest that the new life is a process, and that it must be maintained by a steady effort. This thought is also contained in the following verse.

The *simul* of the Vulgate is due to a reading ἅμα—which is less well supported than ἀλλά.

6. Τοῦτο γινώσκοντες: The phrase can be rendered "Now we know¹ (and we ought to take the knowledge to heart and conform our conduct to it) this." The τοῦτο is what follows. In the "we" Paul puts himself with his readers: the knowledge in question is shared by all Christians (*Cf.* Gal. ii. 16).

The "old man" is the man of the pre-Baptism period, unregenerate man, the "fleshly ego" of vii. 14. That old man has been crucified with Christ ("con-crucified")—*i.e.*, he has been united with the death of Christ on the Cross (*Cf.* Gal. ii. 19, Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι). The dying with Christ is the "being baptised into Christ's death (*Cf.* Gal. vi. 14).

When Christ died for us on the cross He died after the fashion of a criminal, for "He was made a curse for us" (Gal. iii. 13: *cf.* Rom. viii. 3; 2 Cor. v. 21). He offered Himself as a ransom (ἀντίλυτρον) for us (1 Tim. ii. 6), so that in Christ unregenerate man in general was nailed to the cross. By this mystic con-crucifixion unregenerate man was given up to death so that "the body of Sin" should be reduced to impotence (καταργηθῇ) to the end that we should no longer be slaves to sin. The ἵνα clause and the genitive of the infinitive, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς, indicate purpose.

The σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας is the body as the subject of concupiscence, and the instrument of sin. It is here the same as the παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ (Col. iii. 9): when it is dead in baptism, it can no longer be used in the service of sin (*Cf.* vv. 12, 13 below). With the "body of

¹ Not as Cornely renders: *Dummodo hoc cognoscamus.*

sin" compare "the body of this death" (vii. 24). The duty of avoiding slave-service to Sin is another reminder of the still enduring ethical problems of the life of the justified. Note that Sin is here again "Queen Sin."¹ Even though Sin's medium, or weapon, or instrument is put out of action, Sin may reacquire control: hence the need of constant effort² (Cf. Col. iii. 1-3) to walk in the "newness of life." The Vulgate *et ultra non serviamus* ought, of course, to be *ut ultra*, etc. The Vulgate *simul crucifixus est* is not so vivid as the Greek.

7. Ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν, etc.: This is variously explained. According to one theory Paul is giving a reason here for the last clause of v. 6. When the slave of sin has died with Christ he is released from the sway of Sin. He is as fully released from slavery to Sin as a slave is released from his master's control by dying. In this view ὁ ἀποθανὼν would not be "one that dies" in general, but "he that dies to Sin"—referring to the preceding verses.

Others take v. 7 as the statement of a proverb or legal principle—the sense of which is: By suffering death the malefactor is justified—because he is thus set free from his crime. In this view δικαιοῦσθαι ἀπό = ἐλευθεροῦσθαι ἀπό (Cf. Chrysostom). Lagrange favours this view, and quotes as confirmation 1 Pet. iv. 1. In the Tract *Shabbath* 151, quoted by SB, we have: "When a man is dead he is set free from the fulfilment of the Commandments, according to Psalm lxxxviii. 6, "Free among the dead." The Hebrew used for "set free," *na'asah hophshi*, might well be rendered δεδικαίωται. SB. also quote *Nidda* 61b for a similar thought. The idea is, then, that when a man dies all judicial procedure against him must lapse. Even of Christ this is, in a sense, true, for Christ can be said to have, in a manner, paid by His death the debt which He had incurred in regard to Sin—by taking on Himself the burden of the world's sin (Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 3; 2 Cor. v. 21).

From the verses 1-7 it is clear that in the familiar Christian teaching of the time Baptism was not a mere symbol of certain effects, but an *efficacious symbol*, which actually produced the effects it symbolised. In its various stages Baptism symbolised and produced union with the death and resurrection of Christ and communicated to its recipients the effects of that death and resurrection. It must be

¹ The personification of Sin is found in the Old Testament in Sirach xxvii. 10. Lietzmann points out that among other under-world deities we find Ἀμαρτία χθόνια invoked in the Paris Magic Papyrus (Preisendanz, *Pap. Graec. Mag.* i. 120).

² Cf. Chrysostom: ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀπὰς ἀπέθανεν ἐκεῖ, νεκρὸν δεῖ μένειν διαπαντός τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ.

strongly emphasised, in view of modern misunderstandings and false assumptions, that there is nothing in this Pauline (—and obviously general Christian) teaching which owes its origin to heathen Mystery Cults. There is no hint in any Mystery Religion of the possibility of attaining union with a dead and risen Divinity such as is secured by Baptism in the teaching of St. Paul. The necessity of Faith for Baptism, according to the Christian doctrine, is of itself sufficient to exclude all suggestion of magical character or efficacy from the Sacrament. Further, the insistence on the need of constant effort for the maintenance of that union with the Risen Christ which is given by justification, is also utterly opposed to the standpoint of the Mystery Cults—as far as we know them.

There are certain aspects of the Mystery Cults which bear a sort of general resemblance to St. Paul's doctrine of Baptism, but the resemblances are superficial, and the underlying differences are irreconcilable. It should be noted that, while the ritual of the Mystery Cults is concerned with processes of nature which regularly recur, St. Paul speaks of the death and resurrection of a definite historical individual. The Mystery Cults do not at all raise the question of any ethical problem or moral issue in regard to the new life attained by those who have been initiated. With St. Paul Baptism and the New Life bring the obligation of a constant self-dedication to Christ. There is no suggestion in Christian teaching of the new life mechanically maintaining itself like an impersonal natural force. Paul makes it clear that the grace-effects of Baptism may be forfeited by carelessness and sin, and that therefore, Baptism, of itself, does not guarantee entrance into eternal life (*cf.* 1 Cor. x) for those who have reached the age of moral responsibility. It must be noted also that for St. Paul the sin of all men has been already atoned for in the death of Christ, and that by Baptism the individual becomes one with Christ, Who died as the Victim for all men's sins. There is nowhere in the Mystery Cults the notion of such all-sufficiency of atonement, and the communication of its fruits to the individual by means of a sacramental rite.

It is, above all, a fundamental difference between the Pauline doctrine of regeneration and Hellenistic Mysticism that for St. Paul, while the Christian becomes intimately associated and united with Christ, and lives his new life "in Christ," he does not become personally identified with Christ, and he constantly looks forward to an intensification of his personal union with Christ. In the Mystery Cults,

on the other hand, the initiated are regarded as identified with the divinity, and as withdrawn completely from the present world.

These differences are so fundamental as to exclude all possibility of borrowing on Paul's side (See *Revue Biblique*, xvi, pp. 470 ff.—article by Lagrange).¹

(2) *The Sinlessness of the New Life.* VI, 8-14

Repeating what he has already said, Paul infers from our union with the Risen Christ the obligation of the Christian to maintain an utter sinlessness of life. We have died to Sin: we must now with Christ live altogether for God. We must no longer give our bodies to Sin as the weapons (or instruments) of iniquity: we must dedicate ourselves completely to God's service. Though we are "born again" we must make constant effort to repress the tendencies to sin which still remain within us!

8. Εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν, etc.

As we have died with Christ, we have the firm belief that we shall live with Him for ever. The future *συνήσομεν* is not a logical future (like *ἐσόμεθα* in *v.* 5). It refers to the *continuance* of union with Christ during this life, and unending union with Him in glory. Christ died once, but He has been raised up to an unending life. Death has no longer any power over Him. In that unending life of Christ we confidently believe that we shall be united with Him. One of the fruits of justification, as we have seen (*V.* 2), is the confident hope of glory. It seems incorrect to limit the *συνήσομεν* of *v.* 8 to eternal life as such; it includes the whole life of grace as well—the life of the justified which is a life "in Christ."

9. Εἰδότες—"for we know."

Christ being raised up (*suscitatus*, not as Vulgate, *resurgens*) will die no more, for Death has no longer any lordship over Him. This gives the reason for the confident belief and hope of sharing in His life.

Christ raised up from the dead enjoys eternal life, and we confidently hope to share therein with Him, and we shall share therein if we conform our conduct to the ideals of the new life. "He dies no more," and "Death no longer has

¹ It is particularly important to note that Paul here postulates familiarity with his teaching on Baptism in a Church which he had not founded, or helped to found. Liberal critics who regard St. Paul's teaching on the connection of Baptism with the death of Christ as derived from Hellenistic Mysticism, and who look on St. Paul as the protagonist of "Hellenising" in the Early Church, find it difficult to account for the familiarity of the Roman Christians with peculiarly "Pauline" and "Hellenistic" speculation.

lordship over Him," are similar in sense. Toletus says about the "lordship" of Death over Christ: *Dominationem mortis sustinuit Dominus, sed voluntate propter nos; sicut etiam suscepit servi formam*. The voluntary self-subjection of Christ to death is quite in harmony with John x. 17, 18: "My Father loves me because I lay down My life to take it up again. No one takes it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and power to take it up again."

10. Paul here gives two reasons why Christ shall die no more:

(a) By His death He has been definitely snatched away from the domain of Sin.

(b) His life is now altogether for God.

Ὁ ἀπέθανεν and ὁ ζῇ are to be taken like ὁ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί in Gal. ii. 20: ὁ is the accusative, and the sense is "the death which He died," "the life which He lives." The verse means then: The death which He suffered, He suffered τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ once for all; the life which He lives, He lives unto God. That τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ is not an instrumental dative appears from τῷ θεῷ. Christ did not die "through sin," but "to sin" (dative of reference). The reference is not immediately to the Atonement as such, but to Christ's complete liberation from the power of Sin by His death. As living to God implies belonging altogether to God, so dying to sin means breaking away utterly from sin. The "Sin" in question is, again, that power which rules through death: it was able to inflict death on Christ because, for our sake, though He knew not sin, He was made sin (2 Cor. v. 21). But by His death Christ paid the debt of Sin which He had taken on Himself and thus freed Himself absolutely from all further contact with sin. In Baptism we are united with Christ in that death to Sin, and henceforth, like Christ, we should live solely for God.

Note how ἐφάπαξ is put emphatically at the end. Christ submitted Himself once, and once only, to the instrument of Sin (For the use of ἐφάπαξ, cf. Heb. vii. 27; ix. 12).¹

Christ in living for God belongs altogether to God (Cf. Heb. x. 12). This living for God implies living eternally. As Aquinas puts it: "*Quod autem vivit, vivit Deo,*" id

¹ 1 Pet. iii. 18—uses ἀπας in expressing a thought similar to that of the present verse: Χριστὸς ἀπας περὶ ἀμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν—but he clearly means that Christ died *once for all* on account of sins, for in the same context (v. 22) he says that Jesus is at the right hand of God—"having swallowed up death that we might be made heirs of eternal life." It is true this phrase is doubtful, but Harnack and other critics have accepted its authenticity. Cf. with the Petrine passage Heb. ix. 26. In Heb. ix. 27, Christ is said to have offered Himself *once* for the taking away of sin because it is appointed to men to die but once.

est ad conformitatem Dei. Dicitur enim 2 Cor. ult. 4: "Quod si crucifixus est ex infirmitate, vivit ex virtute Dei. Effectus autem conformatur causæ: unde et vita quam Christus resurgens acquisivit est deiformis: sicut ergo vita Dei est sempiterna et absque corruptione . . . ita et vita Christi est immortalis." Chrysostom explains "He lives for God" as, "He lives ἀκαταλύτως—ὡς μηκέτι κρατεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ θανάτου."

11. Through Baptism the Christian has died with Christ to Sin¹—so that Sin should have no further power over him: like Christ, the justified should live henceforth for God only. As the life of the justified is lived in intimate union with the Risen Christ, it is here described as being "in Christ Jesus" (Cf. 1 Cor. i. 4).

The baptised then, by their mystical death, have put off all relation to Sin.

12. Christ cannot die again, for Sin has no longer any power over Him: but with the baptised there is no full guarantee of perseverance, and there is no hope of perseverance without active co-operation with grace. Hence Paul warns his readers not to let Sin resume its sway over their bodies, by giving rein to the lusts of the flesh. "Sin" must, perhaps, here primarily mean disorderly concupiscence, which is called "Sin" by Trent (Conc. Trid., Sess V, Decret. de pecc. orig., Can. v.): *quia ex peccato est et ad peccatum ducit.*² Because it depends on our own free co-operation with grace to maintain our life in Christ, Paul issues this warning. The necessity of our co-operation is implied, according to many commentators, in the use of μὴ βασιλεύτω, instead of μὴ τυραννείτω—for βασιλεύειν suggests a freely-accepted rule.

When Paul speaks of our "mortal body" he hints that the death which even the justified must face is a result of Sin, and he implies, too, that the body undergoes no essential change through justification.

Εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν, etc.: So that ye should give obedience to the lustings of the body: here again it is clearly implied that relapse into sin, if it occurs, will be a freely accepted condition.

Ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ the αὐτοῦ refers to the body; the "lustings" of the body are, of course, the *fomes concupiscentiæ* which survives original sin: the *fomes* would be the natural starting-point for the reassumption of her sway by "Queen Sin."

¹ There are three ancient readings here: (1) εἶναι νεκροὺς μὲν; (2) νεκροὺς μὲν εἶναι; (3) εἶναι is omitted. The addition of τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν at the end is due to the influence of vi. 23. Omit, therefore, in Vulgate (with WW.) *Domino nostro.*

² Sin as a power opposed to God is therefore still in view.

13. Παριστάναι = to put at the disposal of someone. The present παριστάνετε suggests a continuous act, or habit, while the aorist παραστήσατε suggests a single and decisive act performed once for all. Ὅπλα may mean "instruments" or "weapons" (שִׁלָּח): but the latter meaning is the one usual in the New Testament, and it fits the present context better, for Sin is here a ruler that contends with God, and weapons are required for the contest (*arma* rather than *instrumenta*). Cf. 2 Cor. vi. 7; x. 4; Rom. xiii. 12.

Chrysostom explains the idea of weapons of injustice (*i.e.*, of every kind of iniquity) and of righteousness, by taking the case of the eye: if the eye lusts after a forbidden object it becomes a weapon of injustice: if the eye is kept under restraint it becomes a weapon of righteousness.

Weapons of injustice are then weapons used to perform every kind of evil deed, and weapons of righteousness are those which serve for every good and holy purpose.

When Paul says: "Put yourselves at the disposal of God, ὥσπερ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας," ὥσπερ does not mean, "as if you were," but "as such as actually are." The Christian has risen from the dead, and, as living in Christ, he must put himself altogether (once for all) at the disposal of God, and he must offer his members to God as "weapons of righteousness."

14. Paul adds a word of encouragement: "Sin cannot be any longer lord over you for ye are not under the Law, but under Grace." The thought is, that, if they were still under the Mosaic Law, they would still be under the power of Sin, for the Law would merely supply a provocation to their concupiscence, and not a means of controlling it. The Law would thus be useless in the struggle against Sin. But in the new divine economy of Grace help is given abundantly to overcome the flesh and Sin. The Law, instead of bringing with it helps for its fulfilment, was nothing but a cold, and challenging, and threatening set of commands and prohibitions. But in the new economy grace is given so abundantly that God's will is gladly fulfilled.¹ The contrast is sometimes put thus: the Law said "Thou shalt," and only multiplied sin: Grace says, "Thou canst," and gives strength for the victory over Sin. St Augustine puts the matter well: *Non sumus sub Lege bonum quidem iubente, non tamen dante: sed sumus sub Gratia, quæ id, quod Lex jubet, faciens nos amare, potest liberis imperare* (*De Continentia*, iii., 8).

¹ This section would be full of useful instruction and consolation for Gentile Christians who had, prior to Baptism, contracted habits of sin.

(3) *Slavery to Sin has been replaced by the Service of Justice.*
VI, 15-23

As in iii. 1 and vi. 1, so here, Paul rejects emphatically the illegitimate inferences drawn by Libertinism from his doctrine of the freedom of Grace.

Christians have been rescued from the slavery of Sin, and have become the slaves of God. As their slave-service of Sin led to death, so their service of God leads to holiness, and, in the end, to eternal life. For the wages of Sin is death, but the gracious gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus.

15. *Τί οὖν*, etc.: The objection of v. 1 is here practically repeated. It closely resembles that in iii. 8. The insinuation against which Paul proceeds to protest is, that according to Paul, Grace rules to the exclusion of all law. The objection does not, of course, imply that any sort of spiritual Libertinism existed in the Church at Rome.

"If then"—the objection runs—"you have shown that the Law and its restrictions have ceased, and a new age has begun, have we not secured freedom to Sin?"¹

16. This is Paul's answer. Obviously not! No man can serve two masters, and a slave must serve his own master. The Christian, therefore, who has become the slave of Justice, can no longer be a slave of Sin.² While thus excluding service of Sin from the Christian life, Paul hints that in Christianity also there is a *Law*—for that is implied in the obligation of obedience to a Master.

It is possible for the Christian to fall back into the power of Sin: but if he relapses, he makes Christ's work void, as far as he himself is concerned. To work for Sin is to incur the penalty of death—not merely physical death, but (from the contrast in vv. 22, 23) eternal death. The just, it is true, must also die; but in the General Resurrection death is utterly overcome for them, whereas it is only confirmed, as it were, for the wicked.

To make the antithesis perfect, Paul ought to have said in the present verse, "or of justice (or God) unto life." Instead of justice (or God) Paul writes ὑπακοή = obedience to God, which is the direct opposite of ἀμαρτία. While the service of Sin leads to death, the service of "obedience" leads to justice—i.e., virtue or holiness (and that is already the beginning of eternal life). The special ὑπακοή in view

¹ WW. read in Vulgate, *peccavimus*.

² Ed. Meyer points out that men sometimes sold themselves as slaves in the Imperial age, that they might have a secure subsistence (*Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, Vol. iii., p. 472, note 1).

seems to be (according to *v.* 17) the humble acceptance of the Gospel and what it implied.

17-18. The general sense seems to be: Thank God that ye were slaves of Sin, but *are so no longer!*¹ Now they are slaves of "obedience," because from their hearts they have obeyed the doctrine in which they have been instructed.

Ὑπηκούσατε . . . εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς = (according to Chrysostom and the majority of commentators) ὑπηκούσατε τῷ τύπῳ διδαχῆς εἰς ὃν παρεδ. (*Cf.* the Vulgate).²

The τύπος διδαχῆς is the standard teaching given to early Christians. Paul thanks God that they received that teaching so gladly (ἐκ καρδίας).³ Some commentators regard the phrase "type of teaching" as connoting that the "teaching" is to be shown forth in the daily life of Christians—the life being a "copy," or "expression" (τύπος) of the teaching.

Παρεδόθητε seems to be equivalent to ἐδιδάχθητε—so that the whole clause beginning with ὑπηκούσατε may be rendered: Ye became obedient to that form of teaching which ye were taught.

Chrysostom says: "Obedience from the heart denotes free will: but the παραδοθῆναι implies the help of God." Since, however, Paul thanks God for their ready acceptance of the Gospel, he evidently ascribes that also to the Divine influence.⁴

"Slaves of justice" (above, *v.* 16, it was "slaves of obedience unto justice") is an awkward expression, for there is no real enslavement to justice: justice implies freedom, not slavery. Hence Paul apologises for the expression: he uses a comparison with merely human affairs, and he does so because of the weakness of their flesh, which makes them feel the obligations of Christian morality as a yoke, and tempts them to confuse freedom with licence.

19. The phrase ἀνθρώπινον λέγω is like κατ' ἀνθρώπον λέγω

¹ *Cf.* for a somewhat similar construction, Is. xii. 2.

² WW. read, *in qua traditi estis*.

³ *Cf.* Matth. xviii. 35.

⁴ Fr. Lattey in a discussion of verses 17-18 in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1928, and July, 1929, regards the phrase ὑπηκούσατε, etc., as referring to the condition of Law and Sin from which those addressed had been delivered. The reason for thanksgiving would begin, according to Fr. Lattey, with ἐλευθερωθέντες. Fr. Lattey translates therefore: "Thanks be to God that, whereas ye were slaves to Sin, and had given hearty obedience to that form of teaching whereunto ye had been delivered, yet ye were freed from Sin and enslaved to justness." This somewhat forced view is not necessary. It is not implied in the traditional interpolation given in the text that Paul thanks God that his readers were at one time slaves to Sin: ἦτε means that, though they had been, they have ceased to be, slaves of Sin. It is much more likely that the ὑπακούσατε clause refers to the acceptance of the Gospel, because of the use of ὑπακοή in *v.* 16 for the humble submission to the Gospel. The reading οὖν, instead of δέ, after ἐλευθερωθέντες, would exclude Fr. Lattey's rendering: but it is not strongly supported.

(Gal. iii. 15). In the Peshitta version ἀνθρώπινον λέγω is rendered: "I speak as speaking among men"—*akh d'beth b'nainaia 'amar nā'*, and it renders κατ' ἄνθρωπον λέγω in the same way.

As the rule of "Justice" implies, in reality, the most perfect liberty (viii. 15, 21; 2 Cor. iii. 17; Gal. v. 1, 13), the comparison of slave-service (δουλοῦσθαι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ) used to explain the Christians relation to justice is not, therefore, to be taken quite literally. Yet Paul intends by the comparison to bring home to his readers the conviction that there is no room for Libertinism, or licence, in Christianity. He now goes on to explain the nature of the service of justice.

As they had put their members at the disposal of ἀκαθαρσία and ἀνομία¹ so as to produce "lawlessness," now they must offer their members to the service of justice so as to produce "holiness." Note how "impurity" and "lawlessness" or moral laxity take the place of Sin, and how the result of service given to impurity and lawlessness is called ἀνομία—i.e., godlessness in the wide sense. The result of the service of justice is called ἁγιασμός—holiness (= justice, according to v. 16). Jews could scarcely be spoken of as having given slave-service to ἀνομία—since the Law was their chief boast, and we may therefore infer that Gentile Christians are here addressed.

20. When they were slaves of Sin they were "free as to justice" (dative of reference)—i.e., they had nothing to do with justice. It follows that, now that they are "slaves of justice," they are "free" from all dealings with Sin. It is possible that Paul is here still meeting the difficulty already put forward—that by sinning they only served justice. Now they belong wholly to God (or justice), and therefore they are "utterly free as to Sin."

21. Paul now reminds them of the wages that belong to the types of service.

The question is variously understood:

(a) What profit had ye then from the things (ἐκείνων, understood)² of which ye are now ashamed? The answer would be, None!

(b) What profit had ye then? Things (understanding τοιαῦτα) of which ye are now ashamed?³

¹ Εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν is omitted in B: but it is required for the parallelism with εἰς ἁγιασμόν. Paul explains ἁγιασμός in 1 Thess. iv. 3-7.

² Or making ἐφ' οἷς = ἐπὶ τοῦτοις ἅ. WW. read here: *habuistis tunc in quibus nunc*, etc.

³ Pallis' suggestion, ἐφ' ᾧ τοῖς—"What fruit had you then by reason of which you should be ashamed of your present circumstances?" is neither well-founded, nor helpful.

(a) seems preferable, for it leads naturally to the next clause—"Their end is death!" From such things there could be no "profit." The "death," as contrasted with the eternal life of v. 22, must be eternal death.

22. But now, that, freed from Sin, they serve God, they have "fruit" unto holiness which leads to eternal life. The "fruit" which is unto holiness (understand ὁ καρπὸς ὃν ἔχετε ἐστίν (or ἄγει) εἰς ἁγιασμόν) is the good works of the faithful. The faithful have holiness, and they will have eternal life.

23. Paul repeats his teaching solemnly. Note the contrast between ὁψώνια (= soldiers' pay, and then, every kind of wage) and χάρισμα: eternal life, though in one sense a just reward, is, at the same time, a gift of God. It was through Christ Jesus that eternal life was merited for us, and in Him, and with Him, it is enjoyed.

When Paul calls eternal life a χάρισμα he does not deny that it is a just reward for the service of God: he means that, as justification is a free gift of God's grace, so also the merit of justice is only possible through Divine grace. Thus in the last analysis eternal life is a gracious gift of God. Aquinas explains *ad loc.*: *Sic igitur opera nostra si considerentur in sua natura et secundum quod procedunt ex libero arbitrio hominis, non merentur ex condigno vitam eternam, sed solum quod procedit ex gratia Spiritus Sancti.*

Cf. Trent, Sess. VI, cap. 16: *Tanta enim est erga homines [Dei] bonitas ut eorum velit esse merita, quæ sunt ipsius dona.* Eternal life, of course, infinitely transcends our merits.

IV—THE NEW FORCES AT WORK IN CHRISTIANITY.

VII, 1-VIII, 39

(a) CHRISTIANITY HAS ABOLISHED THE SLAVERY OF THE MOSAIC LAW. VII, 1-25

In the preceding discussion Paul has disposed of objections raised against his teaching by Antinomianism and Libertinism. He now goes on to analyse the freedom from the Law which Christians enjoy (vii. 1-6), the relation of the Law to Sin (vii. 7-13), and the helplessness of those under the Law in the struggle with Sin (vii. 14-25).

(1) *The Freedom from the Law secured by the Christian.* VII, 1-6

1. "Those that know the Law" may be those who know the Mosaic Law, or simply those who are familiar with things

legal. If it refers to those that know the Mosaic Law, it is not necessary to suppose that such people must be Jews, for most Christians—Gentiles as well as Jews—were familiar with the Mosaic Law. Many commentators prefer to regard “those that know Law” as meaning those who are familiar with legal affairs; and Romans would, probably, like to have themselves so described. The illustration that follows would be equally pertinent in Mosaic and in Roman Law.

The Romans are here affectionately addressed as “Brothers!”

“The Law lords it over a man as long as he lives” would lead us to expect, “But ye are dead through Baptism, and so the Law has no longer any power over you.” Instead of stating this simply, Paul goes on to convey it by a legal illustration in which the issue is somewhat confused.

2. A married woman (ὑπανδρος γυνή—“She that is under thee,” is the Rabbinical designation of a woman in relation to her husband, SB) is bound to her husband by the Law only as long as he lives. If he dies she is released from “the Law of her husband” (*i.e.*, the Law concerning the husband, ὁ νόμος ὁ περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρός, or the Law which gave rights practically only to the husband), and she is free to marry again. Or the general meaning may be: While husband and wife are alive they are both bound by the law of marriage: but if the husband die, the wife is freed from that law, and may marry another man without incurring censure.

The illustration, at first sight, does not seem to exemplify the principle that the Law lords it over a man only while he is alive; for here it is not the person that dies, but rather the person that survives, that is said to be free from the Law. Some commentators (*e.g.*, Cornely), in order to make the example appropriate, suggest that in the death of her husband the woman dies “mystically,” as a wife, and the widow who survives is a different personality, and, therefore, is no longer bound by the law of the former marriage. The emphasis on the survivor of the “mystical” death may be due to the somewhat similar persistence in the death of Baptism of the person who puts off the “old man” and puts on the new. Or the case of the wife may be considered rather than that of the husband, because the allegiance of the “new man” to Christ is like the cleaving of a wife to a second husband—Christ being a new Spouse.

Probably, however, it is foolish to seek all this subtlety in the passage, and the illustration may be simply intended

to show that death gives freedom from Law—so that it makes little practical difference which of the parties affected by the death is said to be free—since death has brought release to both. Death abolishes the bonds that bound husband and wife to each other, and, similarly, the mystical death of Baptism destroys the ties that bound the unbaptised to the Law. As the wife is free to take a new spouse, so the baptised is free to follow Christ.¹

Κατήργηται—released from : construed with ἀπὸ again in Gal. v. 4.

3. Χρηματίζειν = to bear a name, to be called, to be. The word meant primarily to carry on a business (in middle, to make profit) : then because one often gets a name from one's business, it came to mean, to bear the name of, to be publicly known as.

Γίνεσθαι ἀνδρί = to be joined in marriage with a man—*lihyoth l' 'ish*.² As the relation between Yahweh and Israel in the Old Dispensation was regarded as that of husband and spouse, so also in the New Dispensation the relation between Christ and the Christian Community was thought of as a marriage bond (2 Cor. xi. 2 ; Eph. v. 23 ff). The

4. the faithful have died to the old marriage contract, and they have nothing more to do with it.

This has been brought about, διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ for the body of Christ was slain, and with it was crucified our "old man" (vi. 6). Thus Christians have come to belong to Another—that is, the Risen Christ. Through this "marriage-union" with Christ "we bring forth fruits for God"—i.e., we engage actively in the service of God. The "fruits" are the "fruits" of good works—such works as belong to a life lived altogether for God (*cf.* vi. 8-11, 22).

This fruitfulness unto good of the Christian life, Paul goes on to emphasise, by contrasting it with the unregenerate

¹ Pallis maintains that νόμος here is the object, and τῷ ἀνδρί the instrumental dative—so that the sense would be : "A married woman is bound to the Law by the fact of her husband living" (the "law" being the marriage contract), and in confirmation of this view he quotes 1 Cor. vii. 39 : γυνὴ δέδετα [νόμος] ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς, εἰν δὲ κοιμηθῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι. According to Pallis the argument is : As a woman is bound to her marriage contract during her husband's life-time, so a Jew was bound to the Mosaic Law as long as his carnal self lived : but, as a wife is freed from her contract by the death of her husband, and may remarry, so a Jew, when his carnal nature was destroyed through Christ's crucifixion, was released from the Law and might wed Christ. The Vulgate *vivente viro* might be quoted in confirmation of this view : the Vetus Italia, however, has *viventi viro*.

² Τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίστα : the infinitive may be taken as expressing purpose or result, according as the clause is regarded as expressing the point of view of the legislator, or the natural working of the law.

days when he and his readers were enslaved to Sin, and brought forth fruit for Death.¹

5. Paul puts himself along with his readers—"When we were in the flesh." Since what he says is true of Jews and Gentiles, he substitutes "in the flesh," for "under the Law." To be in the flesh means to be under the domination of the flesh, to be determined completely by the cravings and instincts of the merely natural man: it is the condition of the "old man." The baptised, it is true, are still "in the flesh" (2 Cor. x. 3; Phil. i. 22, 24)—but only outwardly: inwardly they are ἐν πνεύματι (Gal. v. 18, 24, etc.).

In the unregenerate period "the passions of sins" (*i.e.*, the passions which led to sins), spurred on by the Law (τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου),² became active in our members (ἐνηργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν), and made of those members instruments of injustice. The Law, setting up demands which it gave no help to fulfil only stirred up our "sinful" passions so that they brought forth fruit for Death—*i.e.*, engaged in courses of action which could only end in eternal death. Producing fruit for Death is the direct antithesis of producing fruit for God.

6. "But now," etc.: Paul here resumes the comparison with the marriage bond (*vv.* 1-5): we are now freed from the Law "by dying to that in which we were held captive."

There is difference of opinion about the ϕ in ἐν ϕ κατειχόμεθα. Most commentators take ἐν ϕ as referring to the Law (τοῦτο ἐν ϕ). The Vulgate has *a lege mortis in qua detinebamur* following a change of ἀποθανόντες into τοῦ θανάτου (under the influence of viii. 2), which was accepted in early Latin exegesis. The reading τοῦ θανάτου has not strong MS. support. It is reflected in the Itala, as well as the Vulgate. WW., however, read: *morientes in quo detinebamur*.

Some commentators object to the connecting of ϕ with νόμος, on the ground of the redundancy of the phrase: "We have been freed from the Law by dying to the Law by which we were held captive." It is better—those commentators think—to regard ϕ as referring to the enslaved condition described in *v.* 5 or to the previous slavery in the flesh (*Cf.* Lagrange).

For the use of κατειχόμεθα, *cf.* i. 18.

By the death of Baptism, then, we have been freed from the fetters that bound us—whether the fetters of the Law, or the fetters of slavery to Sin—but we still have a service

¹ WW. read here: *ut fructificaremus*.

² Add ὄντα. Chrysostom adds φαινόμενα. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 56.

to carry out. A *slave-service* (δουλεύειν) it is, too, but not a slave-service to the antiquated letter. It is a service performed in an absolutely new spirit. That "spirit" is the grace of the Holy Spirit infused in justification. The service of the Old Dispensation was to the words of the Law's commands—the letter of the Law—and no help was at hand for the accomplishment of that service. In the New Dispensation the δοῦλοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ give their Master glad and willing service, because they are inspired and borne along by His Spirit.¹ The "slaves of Christ" are the only men who are truly free—"for unto freedom has Christ released us" (Gal. v. 1), and "where the Spirit of God is, there is freedom" (2 Cor. iii. 17).

For the contrast of spirit and letter, cf. ii. 29, and for a fuller statement of the thought of vv. 5-6, cf. Eph. iv. 22-24.

Παλαιότης is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament.

ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς indicates a result (Cf. xv. 19). The description of the Christian life as a "slave-service" is intended to exclude all notion of Libertinism from Christian freedom; while the emphasis on the Spirit excludes from the δουλεύειν all harshness and difficulty. The "old letter" and the "new spirit"² recall the contrast between the old man who is "undone because of deceitful lustings," and the "new man who is fashioned after God in true holiness and justice" (Eph. iv. 22, 24). The "oldness of the letter" (= the old letter) is obviously the Law, the ancient written Code.

The phrase δουλεύειν ἐν καινότητι . . . οὐ ἐν παλαιότητι is awkward. The ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος is quite intelligible, for it is not the Spirit, so much as *in* the Spirit that we serve. But, in the second clause, οὐ (ἐν) παλαιότητι γράμματος, the ἐν is not rightly in place, for it was *to* the Letter (= the Law), not *in* the Letter, that the unregenerate gave service. Lietzmann explains the second clause, δουλεύειν ἐν γράμματι (ἐν παλ. γραμ.) as "a rhetorical imitation" of—ἐν κ. πνεύματος.

The thought suggested in the words "newness of Spirit" will be developed in chapter viii.

(2) *The Law as an Occasion of Sin to the Jews.* VII, 7-13

In v. 5 the statement was made that there was a causal nexus between the Mosaic Law and Sin. Does it follow that the Law is something evil and sinful? Paul emphatic-

¹ Cf. Chrysostom: Οὐ γάρ ἐστι γράμμα καταδικάζον, τουτέστιν ὁ νόμος ὁ παλαιός, ἀλλὰ πνεῦμα βοηθῶν.

² "In newness of spirit" = "in a new spirit."

ally rejects such an inference. The Laws given by God to Israel were of themselves holy and good. Yet there is a connection between the Mosaic Law and Sin, and Paul illustrates that connection by his own experience—which is taken as typical of the experience of every Israelite. It was through the commands of the Law that the Jew realised what Sin is, and how vigorously it employs all available instruments to establish its control over men. It stirs up, and makes its servant the concupiscence which lies dormant in men. The full danger of that concupiscence would be first realised when the Jew came to know of the great variety of warnings and prescriptions against it contained in the Law. The Jew could thus learn that the struggle against Sin meant largely the effort required to overcome concupiscence. The very warnings of the Law were only a provocation to his desires, and so Sin made use of the Law to secure her own ends. Without the positive Law Sin would have been comparatively powerless: men would have carried out the natural moral Law with a certain amount of success. But the challenge to concupiscence of the huge corpus of positive law in the Mosaic System was too strong; and lacking the grace-helps of Christianity, the Jews became formal and conscious sinners.

In Paul's childhood he lived, as it were, the life of Paradise before the Fall—a life of complete innocence. But when he came to study the Mosaic Code, that period of innocence ended: his concupiscence burst out into vigorous life, and thus the Law, which should have guided him to life, led him to death. Thus what of itself was holy and just and good was used by Sin to bring about death instead of life. Was it then the Law which produced that death? Surely not! That was altogether due to Sin, and Sin was permitted to use a holy and venerable thing for its own purposes, that men might realise its power and perversity—that it might appear in its true colours, and that men dreading its power, and conscious of their own weakness, might humbly seek help and deliverance from God (see *v.* 25 below).

7. It has been shown that we were freed from the Law to serve God; so that dying to the Law is the same as dying to Sin. What is to be inferred from this? Are Sin and the Law one? Is the Law a power opposed to God?

This question permits Paul to take up the problem of the relation between the Law and Sin. He analyses his own experience of that relation—implying that all who were under the Law have had the same experience as himself.

God gave the Law, and so it cannot be Sin. Yet it is a

fact that Paul came to know Sin through the Law. Sin was, therefore, prior to the Law, and is different from the Law; but there was a causal nexus of some kind between them. The "Sin" which Paul came to know through the Law is that which is rooted in Adam's Sin—the moral corruption which shows itself in the tendency to sin—the hankering after sin, or the ἐπιθυμία (i.e., disorderly concupiscence). Paul first became clearly conscious of that sin—of its strength and resources—when he got knowledge of the Law. That knowledge would come in fairly early boyhood, in the form of familiarity with certain precepts of the Law. For the Jewish boy there would not be first a period of merely natural law; his earliest moral training would be based on precepts and prohibitions of the Law made known to him by his parents and teachers. "Law" here means, therefore, every form of positive divine Law in which the boy Paul was instructed.

It was only when he was faced with commands and prohibitions concerning Sin that he began to realise that, in himself, there was a sort of centre of Sin. When he was faced with the *lo' tahmodh*—"Thou shalt not desire," of the Law (Exod. xx. 17; Deut. v. 18, etc.) he began to realise what a power of "desire" was slumbering within him. Through the stirrings of that power within him Paul realised the strength of Sin; and the "desire" itself (concupiscence) he would not have known except through the Law.¹ Thus through the Law came knowledge of Sin. In coming to know Sin through the Law Paul also began to understand how helpless the Law was to overcome Sin. It was God's gracious plan to bring home to men by the Law the sense of their own proneness to Sin, and their need of God's grace (Cf. Gal. iii. 19).

Note that the clause, τὴν τε γὰρ . . . ἐπιθυμήσεις, serves as a proof of "I knew not sin except through the Law": τε γὰρ means something like "for indeed."

8. If we take ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα with διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς, the sense is that when Sin got an impulse, or start, through the Law, it roused every sort of concupiscence. It is perhaps well to connect διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς with κατεργάσατο, also—Sin not only took ἀφορμή (impulse, excitation, starting-point) through the Law, but also produced every kind of ἐπιθυμία through the Law. The psychological experience here described is analogous with that suggested in *Nititur in vetitum semper cupimusque negata* (Ovid. Am. 3, 4, 17).

¹ Οὐκ ἔγνων and οὐκ ᾔδειν are to be taken as statements of fact—not hypothetically.

The ἐντολή is the individual precept of the Law.

Chrysostom notes that it is Sin—not the Law, that increases concupiscence; and that thus the contrary of that which the Law aimed at was achieved—ὅπερ ἀσθενείας ἦν οὐ πονηρίας. “The Legislator,” adds Chrysostom, “did not give the Law to arouse concupiscence, but to extinguish it. The contrary effect ensued—through our fault, not through His.”

Χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά: Where positive ethical demands were not set up, Sin, though existing, remained inactive.¹ Paul does not consider here the position of those who knew only the natural law. They could sin also, but their passions were not greatly roused by the demands of their practical reason, and they could carry out much of the natural Law of themselves. Besides, according to v. 13, offences against the natural Law, where no positive Law existed, were not so grievous. It is the express positive Law of God that makes certain things “forbidden fruit,” and rouses a fierce longing for them in our lower nature. The Jew knew the will of God very clearly through the Law, but, while the Law sharpened his moral judgment, it neither diminished the force of his concupiscence, nor gave him any special strength to live up to the more clearly known will of God.

The Vulgate, *Sine lege enim peccatum mortuum erat*, takes the statement of a principle as the recording of an event; *mortuum est* would give the correct sense. Sin in the case is dead, as Augustine says, “*Non quia non adsit, sed quia lateat* (Exp. 37). Sin is here still disorderly concupiscence (—“which arises from sin and leads to sin.” Trent).

9. To prove the principle: “Without Law Sin is dead,” Paul appeals to his own experience. He lived without Law when he was a child, when his capacity of moral discrimination had not yet developed. It is not necessary to suppose that Paul is speaking here for the men of the pre-Mosaic period (Chrysostom), or for humanity before the Fall (Theodoret, etc.). Before he began to study the Law Paul lived in childish innocence—knowing nothing of Sin or concupiscence. That was a time of real life (ἐζῶν—“I lived my own life”). The “I” here is the better self, as opposed to the lower nature, the indwelling concupiscence. But when the command—the precept of positive law—supervened, the disorderly concupiscence (=“Sin”) burst out into life.

Ἀνέζησεν does not necessarily mean “lived again”

¹ Cf. iv. 15; v. 13.

(Vulgate, *revixit*). In the previous verse Sin was described as dead, without Law. Now, when the Law comes, the "Sin" that was "dead," showed itself as vigorously alive. Paul does not at all consider the question whether the Sin that was "dead without the Law" had had a previous period of life which now revives. The *ἀνα* in *ἀνέζησεν* does not imply revival—but only a rising up out of a given condition.

- When, then, the Law entered clearly into Paul's consciousness, Sin, awakened, as it were, from death by the Law, leaped up into life to meet the challenge of the Law. With this ended the life of his better self: "I died," says Paul—meaning that Sin was so powerful as to overcome and stifle the good that was in him. The death in question was spiritual death—personal sin, making soul and body unfit for eternal life in Christ.

Yet the command, which thus became the occasion of his spiritual death, ought to have helped to procure for him eternal life (*ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωὴν*). The Legislator has established the Law as a guide to spiritual life, but the Law, as a result of the impulses of Sin, "was found to be" (*εὐρέθη* implies that the discovery was unexpected and painful) the occasion of spiritual death.

In this verse *ἐντολή* may be taken as practically the same as *νόμος*; usually *ἐντολή* is the single precept; *νόμος* the whole code.

- There is a certain pathos in *αὕτη*: that very thing which had been given for life was found, in fact, to lead to death!
11. Paul here explains how the Law became for him a pathway to death. Sin, seizing on the impulse given by the intervention of the Law¹ (*cf. v. 8*), led Paul astray by means of the Law, and slew him by the Law. The slaying was the bringing about of his spiritual death.

Ἐξαπατᾶν is derived from the story of Eve's deception (Gen. iii. 13). Sin represented the Law as an undue and degrading interference of another will, seeking to dominate the will of Paul (as in the Genesis narrative: *ὁ ὄφις ἐξηπάτησέ με*). It depicted the forbidden as something desirable, and the dangerous as something that would bring happiness. Therein lay the *ἐξαπατᾶν*.

It must be remembered that, though Paul throughout this section, 7-11, is drawing, to a certain extent, on his own experience, he puts himself forward mainly as a type of

¹ The word *ἀφορμή* means properly the starting-point, or the base of, a military expedition, so that, as Dodd points out, the phrase, "Sin, ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα, etc.," might be rendered, "Sin found a base of operations in the command."

those who had been under the Law. Hence we must not regard him as speaking here exclusively about himself.

12. We have here the conclusion of the discussion begun in v. 7, and the answer to the question: "Is the Law Sin?"

What the Law prescribes is *holy*, what it defines is *just*, and what it aims at is *good*. This is a completely negative answer to, "Is the Law Sin?" Yet, in spite of this, the Law has led to Sin, and the Legislator's plan would, therefore, seem to have been frustrated.

13. The further question arises then: "Has the good thing become death for me?" (Paul still speaks as the type of a class).

No! That cannot be! A good tree must produce good fruit.

It was not the Law, but Sin, that slew Paul. The Law was merely the occasion, or means, made use of by Sin. God permitted the evil to happen, that Sin might appear in its true colours (ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία). Men would realise how evil and dangerous and reprobate is Sin, when it employs a means of Salvation (the Law) as an instrument of death. It was God's plan that the full heinousness and infamy of Sin thus shown forth should unmask Sin. Thus unmasked, Sin would be ultimately weakened, and more easily overthrown. It would follow then, that, though the Law became the occasion of Sin, it would show to the world the deadly malice of Sin, and thus help to secure the defeat of Sin.

Διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον, etc.: Sin effected (supplying ἦν with κατεργαζομένη to form a periphrastic imperfect) death for me through that which, in itself, was good (the Law), so that it (Sin) might be (and be recognised as) sinful beyond measure, by means of the Law. Chrysostom puts the purpose expressed in the ἵνα clause thus: τουτέστιν, ἵνα φανῇ ἡλίκον κακὸν ἡλίκος ὄλεθρος ἡ ἁμαρτία τοῦτο δὲ διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐδείχθη. Though the Law appeared to be the ally of Sin, it was the Law which made clear the supreme malice (καθ' ὑπερβολὴν¹ ἁμαρτωλός) of Sin. When Sin succeeded in strengthening its influence by that which was good, it became unendurable.

Paul does not imply that there were no just men in the Old Dispensation: he leaves the possibility of genuine holiness under the Law out of consideration. Possibly he would have ascribed such holiness (as he does in the case of Abraham, iv. 2 ff) not to works of the Law, but to faith. His purpose here is to argue against the obstinacy of Jews

¹ For καθ' ὑπερβολὴν cf. Gal. i. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 31; 2 Cor. i. 8.

who professed themselves utterly satisfied with the Mosaic Law, and altogether unwilling to ascribe any value for justification to faith in Christ. He has shown that the Law instead of being all-sufficient for good, becomes normally the instrument of Sin. If men had no other means of justification but the Law, their condition would be desperate. In the next section Paul depicts vividly the helplessness of those under the Law in face of the might of Sin.

(3) *Helplessness against Sin of those under the Law.* 14-25

To make clear the dreadful power of Sin Paul depicts the condition of a man under the Law. To make his picture vivid he uses the first person, and speaks of himself as one under the Law, and fighting the hopeless battle against Sin which those who have no spiritual help but the Law, must fight. The Law demands more than ordinary unassisted nature can achieve, and the Jew who seeks to fulfil it, finds himself thwarted and defeated by the power of Sin. He finds within himself a conflict between his ethical judgment and his natural tendency. He fully agrees theoretically with the claims of the Law, but he fails to carry out its behests. He finds himself subject to a power that tyrannises over his life. He feels in himself the theoretic approval and acceptance of a line of conduct ordered by the Law: but the good which is thus approved of, is left undone, and something evil which his better judgment rejects, is carried out instead. Sin controls him rather than himself. He finds this wretched dualism within him constantly. His reason fully accepts the precepts of the Law, and he would gladly fulfil them, but their fulfilment requires the co-operation of the body, and the submission of the body to the spirit—of the outer man to the inner. But Sin dominates the bodily, sensuous nature, and issues to it commands of its own. These commands are in opposition to the commands of the Law, and since the Law cannot be fulfilled without the help of the bodily part of a man's being, Sin succeeds in preventing the fulfilment of the Law; and the individual Jew becomes the slave of Sin. This slavery can only be overcome when the power of Sin over man's lower nature is destroyed, and the Law cannot destroy it. The position of the Jew under the yoke of Sin is, therefore, desperate, and Paul, as representing such a Jew, cries out despairingly: "Wretched man that I am! who will rescue me from this body of death!"

But Paul has experienced rescue, and bursts forth into a

cry of gratitude—"Thank God—through Jesus Christ Our Lord," rescue is possible !

In a final phrase Paul sets forth clearly the Dualism which the Jew under the Law, and unaided by grace, finds within himself. His reason serves the Law of God, but his flesh serves the Law of Sin.

14. Οἶσμεν γάρ, etc. : The Law cannot of itself be the cause of destruction, for it is *spiritual*, but we are fleshly, and we belong to Sin as if we had been sold to it as slaves.

The "I" is Paul as representing the unregenerate man generally, but, in particular, as representing the Jew under the Mosaic Law : the "I" is the individual with his sensuous nature, unhelped by grace, and faced with the demands of God's positive Law. Paul does not here directly consider the case of the regenerate man.

The Law is πνευματικός—in its source, content, and purpose. The self is σάρκινος—not merely as consisting of flesh and blood, but as left to itself without help of grace, unelevated, "non-spiritual." The "we know" points to the common experience of men. The reading οἶδα μὲν, though it appealed to Jerome, and has recently been advocated by Zahn, need not be seriously considered.

The unregenerate man is not merely σάρκινος¹ (= properly "made of flesh," but it is also used as identical with σαρκικός = "fleshy"), but he is sold as a slave to Sin : πεπραμένος designates a lasting condition. Fallen man is born as a slave, and the enslavement was effected by Adam's disobedience. The verse hints that unregenerate man is in the condition of a slave without personal initiative of his own, and that there was a time when humanity was not so enslaved. It is also hinted here that, just as a slave cannot set himself free, so neither can fallen man, of his own strength, free himself from flesh and sin.

15. Κατεργάζομαι = I set about performing. Οὐ γινώσκω = I do not understand. The unregenerate is a riddle to himself in his conduct. The second half of 15 explains the first. Πράσσω and ποιῶ are practically the same in meaning. The unregenerate does not understand what he does in the service of Sin. He does the opposite of what he wants to do. He wants to do good—which he approves of, and he does evil which he hates. It is as if a foreign principle ruled in him. In regard to the Divine Law there is an opposition between what his will accepts, and what he actually proceeds to do. Thus for Paul the principle that a man must do what he

¹ Both σάρκινος and σαρκικός appear in the MSS. : the reading is uncertain.

sees to be good, is not true. The *bonum* and *malum* of the Vulgate are explanatory glosses. They are omitted in the text of WW. The "willing" and "hating" are genuine acts of "willing" (=wishing, desiring) and hating: they are not mere velleities; but they are not strong enough to overcome the opposition of concupiscence, and, in the end, the will surrenders to Sin.

Free will is present since the will makes both choice and protest; but without supernatural aid, the strength of the will is insufficient to fulfil the more difficult demands of the Law, or to resist very serious temptations. Though the faculties of the soul were neither essentially damaged, nor perverted, by the Fall (since the *vulneratus in naturalibus* of Bede, and the *totumque Adam per illam prævaricationis offensam secundum corpus et animam in deterius commutatum fuisse*, of Trent are to be taken in a relative, not absolute, sense), the will of the man under the Law was unable to withstand the more serious onslaughts of Sin, or to achieve for any length of time, or in difficult circumstances, a high moral result (Cf. Trent, Sess. VI, *De Justificatione*, c. i).¹

In the full analysis of Rom. vii. 16-24, we should take into account, not merely the relative weakening of natural faculties resulting from Adam's Sin, but also the effect on a man's inner life of his own personal sins and the sins of his ancestors.

Heathen writers also have dealt with this moral conflict within the individual. Cf. Ovid (Metamorph. vii., 19-21): *Aliudque cupido, mens aliud suadet; video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor*. Lietzmann quotes the words of Hermes to Tat (Stobaeus i., 61, 1): σεμνή αἴτη ὁδὸς καὶ λεία, χαλεπή δὲ ψυχῇ ὀδεῦσαι ἐν σώματι οὔση. Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐαυτῇ πολεμῆσαι δεῖ . . . τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθὸν σπεύδει, τὰ δὲ πρὸς τὰ κακὰ κατοικεῖ. Epictetus (ii., 26, 4) says of the sinner: ὁ θέλει οὐ ποιεῖ καὶ ὁ μὴ θέλει ποιεῖ.

16-17. Paul goes on to infer from what he has said in v. 15 that on the one hand, the Law is good, and that on the other, he is under the domination of Sin.

When he does the evil which he does not want to do, he approves of the Law by not wanting to do the evil in question. For the evil thing is evil because it is opposed to the Law, and hence the Law itself must be good. In not wanting to do the evil thing he shows, therefore, that his own judgment agrees with what the Law says about itself—"concurr"

¹ The very different position of the man who is "under grace" is expressed in Phil. iv. 13: πάντα ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί με.

(σύμφημι) with the Law, when it declares itself good¹ (Cf. Lev. xviii. 5 ; Deut. iv. 8 ; Ps. xix. 8 ff).

It is impossible, then, that the Law should be the cause of Sin and death. It is rather something excellent (καλός) an ideal of life and conduct (Cf. ii. 17-18, 20)).

17. Paul draws the conclusion from what he has just said : *vuv* is to be taken logically. Since then things are as I have just described—when I approve what the Law prescribes, and abominate the course suggested by Sin, and yet do what I abominate—it is clear that it is not I that do the evil thing, but the Sin that dwells in me !

The evil conduct is not Paul's own : Sin uses him as its instrument.

For οἰκοῦσα B^xal. read ἐνοικοῦσα. Sin has taken up its dwelling in him like the evil spirits (cf. Matth. xii. 45), and he is in its power, like a slave in the power of his master (v. 14).

This verse does not imply that fallen man is not responsible when he surrenders to Sin ; his surrender is a self-surrender with clear consciousness ; and in each particular instance he is free to refuse surrender. The meaning of St. Paul is, that fallen man, unassisted by grace, in spite of the clear teaching of the Law, and his own better judgment, as a general rule surrenders to Sin and thus carries out, not his own will, but the will of Sin. The evil deed then (ἐργάζεσθαι) is primarily the work of Sin.

In his commentary on v. 17 Aquinas says : *Actio maxime attribuitur principali agenti, quod secundum proprietatem suam movet ; non autem agenti quod movet vel agit secundum proprietatem alterius a quo movetur. Manifestum est autem quod ratio hominis, secundum illud quod est proprium sibi, non inclinatur ad malum, sed secundum quod movetur a concupiscentia. Et ideo operatio mali, quam ratio facit, prout est a concupiscentia victa, non attribuitur principaliter rationi, quæ hic per hominem intelligitur, sed potius ipsi concupiscentiæ, vel habitui ex quo ratio inclinatur ad malum.*

The "indwelling" of Sin is directly opposed to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (Cf. viii. 8, 9, 11 ; 1 Cor. iii. 16).

The Sin that dwells in, and controls, the unregenerate is Sin as a power opposed to God. It must, of course, be remembered that there is a strong element of metaphor in Paul's manner of depicting "Queen Sin." Aquinas reminds us : *Dicitur peccatum habitare in homine, non quasi peccatum sit res aliqua, cum sit privatio boni ; sed designatur permanentia huiusmodi defectus in homine.*

¹ Reading ὅτι καλός. WW. read here : *quoniam bona*—without *est*.

18. In verses 18-20 the thoughts of 15-17 are practically repeated, with a further appeal to Paul's personal experience.

From constant experience he knows that in himself—that is,¹ in his sensuous, fleshly self (*caro simul cum viribus sensitivis*. Aquinas) there is no tendency towards the good which God prescribes, but that there is a decided tendency towards the evil that the Law forbids (*Cf. v. 23 and viii. 7*).

This he proves in 18b: Willing the good is in my power (*παράκειται μοι—propinquum est mihi, quasi sub mea potestate existens*. Aquinas), but not the doing of it.² To make the willing efficacious, grace would be necessary. To overcome the tendency of the flesh: Τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής (*Matth. xxvi. 41*).

Τὸ καλόν (= τὸ ἀγαθόν) is to be read with θέλειν, as well as with κατεργάζεσθαι: to οὐ we must supply παράκειται. The Vulgate, *non invenio*, supposes a reading which is fairly well supported—οὐχ εὕρισκω: this would not change the sense.

The phrase, τουτέστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, is regarded as a proof that Paul is speaking of himself in the context as the unregenerate man—such as, we were ὅτε ἡμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί. It might, of course, be argued, on the other side, that the struggle between the higher and lower self continues also in the regenerate, and that Paul realises from the intensity of that struggle how hopelessly the higher self would have sought to maintain itself prior to regeneration.

It is important to note that Paul does not say that the flesh is evil, but only that good does not dwell in it because of Sin. There is no basis here, therefore, for a Gnostic Dualism teaching the intrinsic and essential sinfulness of the Flesh.

19. What has just been asserted is confirmed by the experience that he fails to perform the good of which his higher self approves, and does the evil which he does not will. This is a repetition of *v. 15*.
20. If a man does what he does not desire, but rather abominates, it is clear that it is not his higher self—the ego that approves of the Law—that performs the action, but the “Sin” which dwells in his flesh. The thought is the same as in *v. 17*. The reading οὐ θέλω seems to be better supported than οὐ θέλω ἐγώ. WW. omit *jam*.

¹ Τουτέστιν corrects ἐμοί: in the Ego that wills there is a definite inclination to good (*v. 15*): it is in the carnal part of the Ego that the tendency to evil resides (*v. 17*) (*Cf. viii. 7; Gal. v. 17*).

² This is not in opposition to *Phil. ii. 13*: Θεὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν, because there Paul is speaking of supernatural acts, while here he is discussing naturally good actions.

21-23. The consequences of the foregoing (14-20) are here set forth.

Ἄρα introduces the conclusion from what precedes.

I find, then, that for me—one who wills to do good—there is a νόμος that evil lies ready to hand. We can connect τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοί either with εὕρισκω τὸν νόμον (in which case it is a *Dativus incommodi*—so Vulgate), or with the ὅτι clause (when it becomes dependent on παράκειται). The content of the νόμος is given in the ὅτι clause. The νόμος is a rule or norm—a sort of fixed law. The “law” is the tendency of his lower self, the “law in his members” (v. 23). He calls it a “Law,” perhaps, because it is a sort of rival of the Mosaic νόμος.

22. Συνήδουμι is somewhat stronger than the σύμφημι of v. 16: “I cordially agree with the Law of God according to the inner man”; the Law is the Mosaic Law, the essential goodness of which is here again implied (Cf. v. 14).

The inner man is the reason—ὁ νοῦς. In the Pauline doctrine of “inner man” Lagrange thinks there may be some dependence on Plato, *Republic* ix, where Plato speaks of the struggle of ὁ ἐντὸς ἄνθρωπος with the baser instincts of our nature. For the “inner man,” see also Eph. iii. 16. In 2 Cor. iv. 16 we hear of ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος. While the “inner man” is identical with the higher man, man κατὰ τὸν νοῦν (as opposed to the σάρξ), it is to be distinguished from the “new” man (Eph. ii. 15; iv. 24): there is an “inner man” in the unregenerate, but the “new man” is the regenerate as opposed to the “old man” (=the unregenerate).

23. But while his rational self approves of God’s Law, he sees in his members (in his “flesh”) a “law” of another kind—the tendency to evil dwelling in the members (*i.e.*, in the flesh). That “other Law” contends with the Law of reason (*i.e.*, the tendency of the νοῦς to accept and take pleasure in God’s Law), and shuts him up as a prisoner¹ in the power of the Law of Sin which is in his members.

It seems easier to understand v. 23 if we suppose that Paul has in view two pairs of “Laws” in opposition to each other. On the one side, we have I (a) the Law of God (= the precepts of the divine positive Law, especially those contained in the Mosaic Law):

I (b). The Law of the reason (the tendency of the higher self, or inner man to “concur” with I (a).

¹ Both ἀντιστρατευόμενον and ἀιχμαλωτίζοντα are, like ἀφορμή in v. 11 above, military terms.

On the opposite side, we have :

II (a). The Law of Sin (the whole system of Sin's behests considered as a negative counterpoise to the I (a)).

II (b). The Law in the members—the innate tendency of the flesh towards II (a). It is this Law in the members II (b) that makes me a captive in the power, and under the Law II (a) of "Queen Sin." The "me" which is made captive is, of course, the higher man. II (b), naturally, is in fierce opposition to I (b).

Ἐν τῷ νόμῳ [τῆς ἀμαρτίας] cannot be a mere dative of instrument; αἰχμαλωτίζοντα suggests the idea of the Law as a sphere (or prison) within which "I" am held captive (Cf. Gal. iii. 23).¹

24. The outcome, then, is that Paul, representing the unregenerate, is kept a wretched captive in the power of "Queen Sin," by the "Sin" which dwells within him. The yoke of Sin's slavery is intolerable, and he gives expression to his misery in the cry: "Unhappy me! Who will rescue me from the body of this death?"

The "body of this death" (or, "this death-body") is the body as slave to Sin which brings to Paul both spiritual and physical death.

Partial parallels like τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης (Acts v. 20), and ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης (Acts xiii. 26), where the demonstrative seems to go in sense with the first noun, suggest that τοῦτου should be regarded as belonging to σώματος rather than to θανάτου. Commentators who explain "death" here as primarily spiritual death, prefer to connect the "this" with "death" (—such death as this: cf. v. 23), and the Vulgate *de corpore mortis hujus* bears out this construction. Yet even if τοῦτου is connected with σώματος, the main reference may still be to spiritual death, for Paul's despairing cry is not primarily for rescue from this mortal body (as Chrysostom and others say) but from the body as slave of Sin and destined thereby for both physical and spiritual death. Origen explains that the body is called a body of death because it is the cause of death.²

Lagrange, who insists here on the contrast between the misery of the unregenerate, as Paul depicts him, and the self-sufficiency of the Stoic, aptly refers to Epictetus' mockery,

¹ The form νοός here and νοί in v. 25 are the Hellenistic third declension forms which in the New Testament have taken the place of the classical second declension forms, νοῦ and νοῖ. See Moulton, *Gram. of New Testament Greek* ii, p. 142.

² It might be possible to take σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου—as as a single expression—"death-body," and thus to take τοῦτου immediately with σώματος. "Death-body" would not be the same in meaning as "mortal body" (v. 12), for in the present context the body appears rather as an agent, than as a victim, of death.

of those who say : 'Τί γάρ εἰμι; ταλαίπωρον ἀνθρωπάριον' καὶ 'τὰ δύστηνά μου σαρκίδια'—"words," says Lagrange, "which look like a caricature of the Apostle's outcry."

- 25a. The answer to the despairing cry of the unregenerate for a helper, Paul knows from experience; but instead of giving a simple answer, he gives thanks in a sudden dramatic outburst to the Saviour who rescued him from "this body of death."

The textual tradition of the thanksgiving is not consistent. There are five forms of the text : (1) χάρις τῷ θεῷ; (2) χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ; (3) ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ; (4) ἡ χάρις κυρίου; (5) εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ. Apparently (3) and (4) are corrections of (1), and (5) has arisen from a double writing of τω—producing the monstrosity ΧΑΡΙΣΤΩΤΩ, which was then made intelligible by prefixing ΕΥ—εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ. Since the chief corrections point back to (1), it may be regarded as the primitive text;¹ (2) is then Secondary—the δε having been inserted to make the introduction of the thanksgiving less abrupt. The Vulgate is based on (3)—but it really misrepresents Paul. He does not say, "The Grace of God will deliver me!"—but "Thanks to God through Jesus Christ Our Lord!" In this thanksgiving Paul passes, for an instant, from his rôle of the unregenerate to give heartfelt thanks to his Deliverer. The thanksgiving is offered to God through Jesus Christ, because through Christ has come the grace of redemption.²

- 25b. "Ἀρὰ οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγώ, etc. : Paul here summarises all he said above. He is now back again in the rôle of the unregenerate : αὐτὸς ἐγώ (= I left to myself—without grace and redemption)³ serve with my reason the Law of God (I a above : v. 23), but with my flesh the Law of Sin (II a above). The service (δουλεύω) to the Law of God is obviously little more than a velleity, while the service to the Law of Sin is *voluntate et opere*.

b. THE CHRISTIAN'S LIFE IN THE SPIRIT. VIII, 1-39

In the preceding chapter Paul analysed the condition of men living under the Law without strength to fulfil its commands, and overborne by the power of Sin. Now he goes on to depict the Christian life with its endowment of God's Spirit and all the abundance of aiding grace which that endowment implies.

He first describes the rescuing act of God by which the

¹ (1) is given by B, Sahidic, Origen—and once by Jer.

² For similar thanksgiving to God for redemption cf. vi. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 17.

³ It does not mean that it is one and the same Ego that serves both Laws. Paul would have expressed that by ὁ αὐτός.

power of Sin was broken, and men were enabled to walk according to the Spirit (*vv.* 1-4). In verses 5-8 he contrasts vividly the conditions of "men of the flesh" and "men of the Spirit." In verses 9-13 Paul shows that the spirit actually dwells in the Christian, and points out that, through that indwelling, the life of the Christian is the life of a *pneumatikos* or spiritual being. Even the bodies of Christians are made to share in the quickening of the indwelling Spirit. The Christian has, therefore, no further obligations to the Flesh—so as to be compelled to yield to its demands. Such yielding would bring death. The whole being of the Christian must be dominated and directed by the Spirit.

In the following section (*vv.* 14-17) Paul depicts the Christian as the child and heir of God. God regards the Christian, in whom His Spirit dwells, as His own child, and the Christian, on his side, through the indwelling Spirit, realises the Fatherhood of God and, with a child's confidence, cries to God, "Father!" But if we are God's children, then we are also God's heirs, and the co-heirs of Christ. If, in our Christian lives, we must suffer with Christ, we know that we shall also share in His glory.

In verses 18-25 Paul indicates how nature generally looks forward eagerly to our complete glorification with Christ. It is only when our full glory as children of God and brothers of Christ is attained, that the curse, which Adam's Sin brought on all creation, will be completely undone; and nature, still suffering from that curse, sighs and mourns until the last trace of Sin's slavery is abolished. We, too, who already possess the "first fruits" of the Spirit, but are still, as to the body, under the influence of Sin's power, long with sighs for the completion of our freedom from Sin and corruption, and the attainment of glorification.

In the next section (26-27) Paul shows what a powerful help the Christian has against all the troubles and difficulties of life in the prayers which the indwelling Spirit not merely puts in his heart, but utters along with him to God.

In verses 28-30 Paul reminds his readers of the consolation contained in the call to Faith and Salvation. Those that God predetermined, He called, and those that He called He justified, and those whom He justified He glorified. Thus the Christian already possesses in germ the blessedness of the glorified, and the Christian, who at heart is genuinely a Christian, can go serenely forward, realising that that blessedness is steadily unfolding in himself. All this, of course, postulates unflinching love of God, and co-operation with the divine plans, on the part of the Christian.

The concluding verses of the chapter (31-39) are a sort of Hymn of which the theme is the certainty of salvation.

God has given us every assurance of His love: in our interest He has not spared His own Son. Surely He will not, in the end, reject us! If God will not condemn us—Surely neither will Christ, Who died for us, and pleads for us with the Father!

If then we can be confident that the Judgment will not bring condemnation, surely there is no ill or misery or calamity that can part us from Christ's love. Nor can there be any power of destiny—death or life, or the present, or the future, or any angelic being—whether principality or power of Height or Depth, that can sunder us from the love of God, which shows itself in Christ Jesus, Our Lord!

(1) *The Christian is under the Law of the Spirit.* VIII, 1-4

- 1 "Ἀπα implies that we have here an inference: it is an inference from all the foregoing, in ch. vii. Paul had shown in ch. vii. that the "old man" was a slave of Sin, and that condemnation to death was implied in his slavery (vii. 24). He now infers that the Christian who has died to Sin in Baptism is utterly free from that "condemnation." As dead to the Law, and bound up with Christ Jesus in community of life, the justified must be free from condemnation to eternal death.

Κατάκριμα is sentence of condemnation—*damnatio et quantum ad culpam et quantum ad pœnam* (Aquinas). To such sentence those under the Law were almost inevitably exposed because of the practical impossibility of their observing the Law, when left to themselves. But the Christian who has died to the Law (vi. 14; vii. 1 f.), and lives in Christ, is obviously free from condemnation for failing to keep the Law.

"Those who are in Christ Jesus" are contrasted with the αὐτὸς ἐγὼ of vii. 25. Estius explains: *Qui sunt Christo insiti per baptismum et in eo regenerati quamvis adhuc carne servant legi peccati, jam nullum amplius habent peccatum quantulumcumque; neque propter peccatum ulli pœnæ amplius sunt obnoxii.* The Council of Trent (Sess. V., c. 5) uses the verse to show that Baptism produces complete remission of sin: *In renatis nihil odit Deus, quia nihil est damnationis iis qui vere consepulti sunt cum Christo per baptismum in mortem . . . ita ut nihil prorsus eos ab ingressu cœli remoretur.*

That Paul speaks in ch. vii. as an unregenerate, is borne out by vñv. "Now" (i.e., when the grace of redemption is being applied) implies an earlier pre-Redemption period,

from the standpoint of which Paul is naturally regarded as speaking in ch. vii.

The Vulgate adds here, *qui non secundum carnem ambulant*, and the Textus Receptus adds further, ἄλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα. The Vulgate insertion is an interpolation from v. 4. The Textus Receptus, μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, ἄλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα, Lietzmann describes as "a typical interpolation of the *Koine* based on viii. 4." The short reading, though it has practically only Egyptian support, is almost certainly the original.

It is obvious that since "those who are in Christ Jesus" have no absolute guarantee of perseverance, Paul must mean that there is no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus, *as such*.

2. We have here the reason for the exclusion of κατὰ κριμα from those who are in Christ Jesus. "The Law of the Spirit of the life which is in Christ Jesus" has rescued them from the law of Sin and Death.

In the pre-Redemption period the Law of Sin had been dominant—using even the Law of God itself, which men's reason approved of, as its instrument, and finding a strong ally in the tendency of concupiscence (the "Law in the members"). That Law of Sin led to death. But now a new period has begun. The power of Sin has been broken, and, instead of the domination of Sin, there is the reign of grace which leads to eternal life. The Christian is no longer under the slavery of Sin: his life is "in Christ Jesus": it is lived in intimate union with the Risen Christ. Concupiscence is controlled by grace, and the "law in the members" no longer prevails against the "law of the mind" (vii. 23). The "spirit" of the life in Christ is not the Holy Spirit precisely: it is rather the tendency, or attitude, or "spirit," which the Holy Spirit imparts. The "law" of that spirit is its fixed tendency, its dominance in the control of the Christian's conduct—just as the Law of Reason (vii. 22 ff.) is the reason's willingness to accept God's Law, and the "Law in the Members" is the normal tendency of concupiscence to oppose that Law.

As Aquinas points out (*ad loc.*) a merely human law does no more than announce to the citizen what he is to do. But the Code that directs the life of the Christian is different, for, *Spiritus sanctus mentem inhabitans non solum docet quid oporteat fieri, intellectum illuminando de agendis, sed etiam affectum inclinatur ad recte agendum*. This enlightenment and tendency, which the Holy Spirit communicates, constitute the "spirit" of the "life in Christ Jesus"; and the

'Law' of that spirit is its attitude of enthusiastic approval of the things of God, its cordial agreement with the Law of God (vii. 22), its habit of like-mindedness with Christ. In this new manner of life the individual is no longer helpless before the onset of Sin: he has strength to resist the concupiscence which still remains in the justified. Finally, the spirit of the Christian life not merely implies freedom from the rule of Sin, but also freedom from death, since for the justified, physical death is not associated with eternal death, but is only a transition to a still closer union with Christ (*Cf.* Phil. i. 21-23).

A great many commentators take ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ with ἡλευθέρωσεν and render: "The Law of the Spirit of life has set thee (or me) free through Christ Jesus." The verse read in this way would mean that the Spirit Who gives life, or the Spirit Who is life, has freed Christians from the law of Sin and death through the redemptive work of Christ. The Spirit, in this view, would be the Holy Spirit Himself—the vivifying Spirit of God, and the "Law of the Spirit" is then explained either as the Spirit Himself, or the Law which manifests the will of the Spirit. Just as the "Law of Sin" is regarded by St. Paul as a sort of system of principles and tendencies opposed to the Law of God (vii. 23), and leading to death, physical and eternal, so in the new period of grace there is another system of laws and tendencies, which not merely points out the path to life, but gives strength to tread it. That system is not called simply the "Law of God," because there was a "Law of God" in the old period, but "the Law of the Spirit of life," for it is a Law which brings with it the abundant grace of God's life-giving Spirit (*Cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 6). In a special sense this new Law of Grace has helped to free men from "the Law in our members" by giving them strength to resist disorderly concupiscence. The Mosaic Law (the "Law of God") had, as we have seen, brought men rather embarrassment than help in the struggle with their unruly concupiscence.

In this view of the verse the answer to the cry in vii. 24: τίς με ῥύσεται is here definitely given: "The Spirit of life has delivered thee through Christ Jesus," etc.¹

In explaining the verse it does not seem very greatly to matter whether we take "spirit" with a small s (like the Vulgate) or with a capital, whether, that is we understand it directly of the Holy Spirit, or of His work. It must be admitted, however, that the grouping of words which gives

¹ The manuscripts vary fairly equally here between με and σε.

the sense "of the life which is in Christ Jesus," is more in harmony with the immediate context (τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, v. 1) and with Pauline expression generally, than that which would make ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ the statement of the means (instrumental dative) by which men have been freed from the power of Sin.

3. Τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον, etc.:

The verse means that what the Law could not do God has done—viz., liberated men from Sin. The text has been construed differently according to the meaning assigned to ἐν ᾧ: (a) τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου has been taken as an absolute nominative construction = ὁ γὰρ τῷ νόμῳ ἀδύνατον ἦν. The thing that was impossible to the Mosaic Law has to be inferred from what follows: it is the liberation of men from the fetters of Sin and death. The Law could not do this *because* (ἐν ᾧ) it was weak through the flesh—i.e., the concupiscence dwelling in the flesh. This "weakness" of the flesh made the God-given Law of Moses a means to sin, thus transforming something which was intended to lead to life, into an instrument of death (vii. 16). The Law thus showed its impotence to abolish Sin. But God has overthrown Sin by sending His own Son in a flesh like the flesh of Sin, to deal with Sin.

(b) Ἐν ᾧ has been taken as a relative (cf. Vulgate *in quo*): What was impossible for the Law in that department in which it was weak through the flesh—God has accomplished. If τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον is taken as an absolute accusative, something like ἐποίησεν may be added to complete the expression.

Because of the power of Sin over concupiscence it was impossible for those under the Law to fulfil the Law's commands. Paul is not discussing here the relation of the Mosaic Law to justification. He has done that already. The incapacity of the Law to impart justification was not due to weakness of the flesh: it was inherent in the Law. Paul is speaking here of the condition of fallen man—who lacks not merely justification, but suffers also from such weakness of the Flesh that he cannot fulfil the whole Law even *quoad substantiam operis*, though this would have been possible in a condition of *integra natura* (so, Dominicus Soto). If fallen man could not even fulfil the whole Mosaic Law, *quoad substantiam operis*, there is no need for Paul to speak, for the moment, of the absence of that which is absolutely necessary for justification—sanctifying grace.

To accomplish what to the Law was impossible God instituted a policy of astounding love and mercy. He sent His only Son "in the likeness of the flesh of Sin"—i.e., in

flesh like sinful flesh; and He sent Him *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*—"because of Sin" (*i.e.*, to deal with Sin, to overcome sin); and thus condemned sin in the flesh. God sent His Son, on account of sin, in a genuine human nature, but in a sinless human nature. When the Word assumed our nature He could not assume a sin-infected nature, and, in so far, He was not perfectly like us. The word *ὁμοίωμα*, while hinting at such unlikeness, does not suggest any doubt about the reality¹ of Christ's human nature. The flesh of sin = sinful flesh: it is human nature infected with original sin, as depicted in chapter VII. Theodoret notes that Paul does not say, "In the likeness of flesh," but "In the likeness of the flesh of sin."

The mission of the Sinless Man² was relative to sin, *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* (*cf.* 1 Pet. iii. 18; Mark i. 44; Heb. x. 8); its purpose was to release men from sin (*Cf.* John i. 29).

The Vulgate punctuation *in similitudinem carnis peccati, et de peccato damnavit* gives a misleading sense; *damnavit* should be separated from *peccato*.

Πέμψας . . . κατέκρινεν, etc.: We must read the participle with the finite verb of the clause. Thus, at first sight, Paul would seem to say that in sending His Son in our flesh God condemned sin—that is, that the condemnation was effected by the Incarnation alone. If the text is understood in this way the "condemnation" (*κατέκρινεν*) of sin must mean the destruction of its mastery over men. Our Lord Himself points to His miracles as a token that the Devil's power over men is broken (Matth. xii. 27–29; Mark vii. 27; Luke xi. 21–22). The Incarnation of Christ, in itself, was the beginning of the overthrow of sin, and contained in itself already the condemnation of sin (understood as a power hostile to God). The flesh in which the sentence of condemnation was published would be the flesh of the Incarnate Word (*Vide* Lagrange).

The more common exegesis of the passage refuses to take *πέμψας* as implying that in the very moment of sending the Incarnate Word God condemned Sin: the participle should rather be understood as = "by sending," and the mission in question refers not merely to the Incarnation, but to the whole redemptive work of Christ and particularly to His death (*cf.* Gal. iv. 4 f.). The partisans of this view take *κατέκρινεν* as meaning that God not merely pronounced sentence of condemnation on Sin, but executed it. The

¹ *Cf.* i. 23; v. 14; vi. 5; Phil. ii. 7, for Paul's use of *ὁμοίωμα*.

² For the Sinlessness of Christ see 2 Cor. v. 21, and Heb. iv. 15: *πεπειρασμένον δὲ κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*.

sentence of condemnation was executed in the flesh of Christ Himself on Calvary—τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ (2 Cor. v. 21). By enduring in His own flesh the penalty due to Sin, Christ put an end to the rule of Sin. The discussion in vi. 6-11 had already insisted on the victory over Sin and death which Christ secured by His own death, and that discussion makes it more likely that κατέκρινε in the present passage means the actual execution of the sentence of condemnation against Sin.

The Christian who in Baptism was united mystically with Christ crucified is also dead for Sin : he lives henceforth for God, to bring forth fruit for God, and to give service to justice (vi. 6, 10, 11, 18).

4. God "condemned" Sin in the flesh of His Son, that the δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου (*i.e.*, the whole complexus of δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου, (ii. 26)—the moral demands of the Mosaic Law) may be fulfilled in us, who walk according to the Spirit. The fulfilment of all the ethical precepts of the Law is possible to the Christian, because he is guided and borne along by the grace of God, and is no longer dominated by concupiscence. "Spirit" here, as contrasted with "Flesh," does not mean the Holy Spirit, but rather the inspiration of grace—the *instinctus Spiritus Sancti* (Aquinas).

For those under the Law it was practically impossible to carry out all its ethical demands, because the time of "grace" had not come. But in the new period all the demands of the Law can be fulfilled, through the help of the abundant graces which the Christian receives.

The "precepts" of the Law in question are those which conveyed the moral ideal of the Mosaic Law. Not a jot or tittle of those could be changed, and by the grace of God they could be fully observed. Note that in saying that the precepts are fulfilled *in* us rather than *by* us Paul wishes to emphasise that it is the power of grace, and not our own strength that secures their fulfilment. At the same time, however, he insists in περιπατοῦσιν on the necessity of our co-operation with divine grace.

(2) Contrast between the Spiritual and the Carnal. 5-8

Paul now works out in detail the contrast made in v. 4 between walking according to Spirit, and walking according to the Flesh. It is a complete contrast of outlook and tendency.

5. To express the fundamental tendencies of man's moral and religious life Paul uses the formulæ κατὰ σάρκα εἶναι, and κατὰ πνεῦμα εἶναι: to express the working out in practice of a fundamental tendency he uses φρονεῖν. As in the preceding verse, πνεῦμα is grace, rather than the Holy Spirit. Those who "are according to the flesh" (the σαρκικοί), whose guiding principle is the flesh, set all their thought on, are interested solely in, take sides with (φρονοῦσιν) "the things of the Flesh" (i.e., what belongs to the sphere of the Flesh, or what satisfies the lusts of the Flesh). On the other hand, those who are according to the Spirit (the πνευματικοί), set their minds and hearts exclusively on the things of the Spirit (what grace aims at, the fulfilment of the Divine will, etc.).

Gal. v. 19-24, with its detailed contrast of the "works of the flesh," and the "fruit of the Spirit," is an admirable illustration of the antithesis between the φρονεῖν of the "fleshly" and that of the "spiritual."

6. The φρόνημα, the general bent of thought, the practical tendency and effort of the Flesh,¹ leads to death. The Flesh and its lusts end in eternal death. But where the whole tendency of the mind is towards the things of the Spirit, there also is life and peace in vital union with Christ.

The γάρ in v. 6 is difficult to explain: it may be a parallel to the γάρ of v. 5, so that both 5 and 6 are explanatory of the antithesis in v. 4; in v. 5 we have an antithesis of two groups of individuals; and in v. 6 an opposition of Flesh and Spirit (= grace), thought of as two persons whose tendencies are most radically opposed.

"Peace" is added to "life," perhaps, to serve as an introduction to the ἔχθρα of v. 7.

In the opposition between Flesh and Spirit there is no question of a dualism in man, but only of a contrast between types of men living in different circumstances—either as united with Christ, or as persisting in sin.

7. This verse explains why the φρόνημα of the Flesh is death. It is so, because the attitude of the Flesh is hostility (*inimicitia* not *inimica*, as the Vulgate has it) to God; and the ground of that hostility is that the Flesh is moved towards evil by its indwelling concupiscence, and therefore cannot submit itself to God's will: it cannot submit itself, because, as Augustine says, *Injustitia justa esse non potest*: it cannot submit itself, *as such*, to God's Law.² Paul does not say, says Augustine, *Homo non potest*, but, *Prudentia*

¹ The Vulgate *prudencia* is hardly an adequate rendering of φρόνημα.

² WW. read, *inimica est in Deum: legi enim Dei non subicitur*.

carnis non potest : vitium non potest, non natura. Aquinas puts the same thought thus: *Prudentia carnis vitium est quoddam ; ipsum vitium Deo subjici non potest, cum ipsum vitium sit aversio a Deo, vel a lege Dei, sicut ille qui est niger potest fieri albus, sed ipsa nigredo nunquam potest fieri alba.*

8. Those who are in the Flesh are those who are "according to the Flesh" (v. 5): the δέ is equivalent to "I say"—resuming what has been said. Those that are in the Flesh, dominated as they are by the Flesh, cannot, as such, please God, for no man can serve two masters (Matth. vi. 24). The phrase "cannot please God" is a litotes: they cannot escape His condemnation. But, as Aquinas adds, *possunt desinere esse in carne . . . et tunc Deo placebunt.*

(3) *The indwelling Spirit.* 9-13

The baptised are not in the Flesh, but "in the Spirit," and Paul now proceeds to show that their "life in the Spirit" involves a special kind of divine presence which is called the indwelling of the Spirit.

9. In this verse the first πνεῦμα, as in the preceding verses of this chapter, means sanctifying grace; but the second is the Holy Spirit. Εἴτερ does not directly suggest a doubt: it means "If, as I believe is the case." Yet it leaves the possibility open that a Christian may be deprived of the indwelling of the Spirit. The same is implied in the following: "If anyone has not the Spirit of Christ, he is not His." The Vulgate in v. 9 ought to be *si quidem*, rather than *si tamen*. Note that Paul calls the Holy Spirit here the Spirit of God, and then, evidently referring to the same Spirit, calls Him the Spirit of Christ. Since, however, "the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son as from one principle, and by a single spiratio" (Coun. of Florence), *idem est Spiritus Christi et Dei Patris ; sed dicitur Dei Patri in quantum a Patre procedit: dicitur Spiritus Christi in quantum procedet a filio* (Aquinas).¹ If anyone has not the indwelling Holy Spirit he does not belong to Christ—he is not in living communion with Christ. Aquinas explains: *Sicut non est membrum corporis quod per spiritum corporis non vivificatur, ita non est membrum Christi qui spiritum Christi non habet.*
10. If Christ is in you, etc.: The Spirit of Christ and Christ Himself are one in the divine nature, and hence, the indwelling of the Spirit is also the indwelling of Christ. From the περιχώρησις or *circuminsessio*, which arises from the

¹ Cf. John xiv. 26 ; xv. 26 ; Phil. i. 19.

identity of the Divine nature in the Persons of the Trinity, it follows that one Divine Person cannot be divided or separated from another, but, *citra confusionem ac servato discrimine insunt in se invicem; ut adeo ubi est divina natura ibi quoque sunt tres Personæ divinæ* (Petavius, *De Trinitate*. Lib. iv., cap. xvi.). Chrysostom notes here that Paul does not identify Christ with the Holy Spirit, but only says that whoever has the Spirit, not merely belongs to Christ, but possesses Christ Himself: οὐ γὰρ ἔστι Πνεύματος παρόντος μὴ καὶ Χριστὸν παρεῖναι; ὅπου γὰρ ἂν μία τῆς Τριάδος ὑπόστασις παρῇ, πᾶσα πάρεστιν ἡ Τριάς.¹

Through the indwelling of Christ the soul is participant in eternal life on account of (διὰ) justice—on account of the holiness or justice with which grace adorns the soul. But the body of such a one is “dead”—i.e., subject to death (*necessitati mortis addictum*. Aquinas) on account of (διὰ) Sin—that is, Adam’s Sin and Sin generally: νεκρόν is used here proleptically, instead of θνητόν (*Cf.* v. 11).

The πνεῦμα which is life on account of justification, is the soul (= spirit) as elevated by sanctifying grace. The expression “the spirit is life,” instead of “the spirit is living,” means that the spirit is altogether living. The Vulgate weakens the sense by rendering *spiritus vivit*. The Vulgate version of διὰ δικαιοσύνην—*propter justificationem*, ought properly to be *propter justitiam*. Paul is speaking of the condition of the justified, rather than of their justification. The “justice” here is not justice to be accomplished (as if the reference were to the fruits of the spirit), but the holiness which belongs to the πνευματικοί.

11. Though the body is “dead” because of Sin, yet the indwelling of the Spirit of God in the soul affects the body also, giving it hope of resurrection. As God raised Jesus from the dead, He will also give life to our “mortal” bodies because of His Spirit which dwells in us.

Works of power are appropriated to the Father, and so Jesus is said to be raised up as man from the dead by the Father (*cf.* iv. 24; vi. 4). Hence the Spirit of the Father is spoken of here because it is the omnipotence of the Father that fulfils the hope here held forth.

The Spirit of God will vivify our bodies (ζωοποιήσει)—i.e., will make them to share in that life in which the soul participates by sanctifying grace (*Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 20). This will take place at the General Resurrection (*Cf.* 2 Cor. v. 4 ff.). In 1 Cor. vi. Paul speaks of our body as a temple (ναός)

¹ *Cf.* John xiv. 23, where the indwelling of Father and Son is promised to those that love Christ.

of the Holy Spirit. Thus both in soul and body those who "are in Christ" are free from κατάκριμα (viii. 1).

The reading at the end of *v.* 11 varies between (*a*) διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα and (*b*) διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος. In (*a*) the Spirit is the pledge or guarantee of resurrection: in (*b*) the Spirit is the agent of the resurrection. The Vulgate seems to support (*a*) by its rendering *propter inhabitantem Spiritum*; and (*a*) is supported also by the Pauline teaching elsewhere formulated (2 Cor. 1. 22; v. 5; Eph. i. 14; Rom. viii. 23), that the indwelling Holy Spirit is the "earnest" (ἄρραβών) of the inheritance of eternal salvation. The weight of evidence, however, is in favour of (*b*). Lietzmann regards (*a*) as due chiefly to the tendency of Late Greek to use the accusative, rather than the genitive, with prepositions. He thinks that (*a*) is possibly also due to the influence of διὰ δικαιοσύνην (*v.* 10). This teaching about the participation of the body in the glorious life of the soul shows that a dualistic theory, making the flesh something essentially evil, is utterly remote from St. Paul's thought. The Spirit of God could not dwell in something intrinsically evil as His Temple, nor make it a sharer at the General Resurrection in the glory of Him Who is the "first fruits of those that sleep" (1 Cor. xv. 20 ff.).

12. Ὑποῦν, etc.: This is an inference from the preceding (with special reference to *v.* 10).

Since grace has freed us from the slavery of the Flesh and its concupiscence, we have no longer any obligations towards the Flesh, to follow its behests. The construction ὀφείλεται ἔσμέν οὐ τῇ σαρκί implies the contrasted statement, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι. But Paul omits the latter because he wishes to warn his readers against the danger of fleshly impulses which still remain in the baptised. They are living indeed in Christ Jesus, but they must take care "that Sin do not rule again in their mortal body so as to obey its lustings" (vi. 12 ff.). We see here again in the reference to obligation the desire of Paul to exclude all suggestion of Libertinism from Christian life.

The genitive construction τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν expresses result: we are not under obligations to the flesh so that we must live according to the flesh.

13. To obey the promptings of the Flesh would bring death for body and soul.¹ The πράξεις (= "intrigues") of the body must be slain by the Spirit—i.e., the lustings of corrupt

¹ ΜΕΛΛΕΤΕ ΑΠΟΘΝΗΣΚΕΙΝ = Ye are bound, according to God's decree, to die. The Vulgate *Moriemini* is not sufficiently dramatic.

nature must be suppressed by the help of grace—in order that we may live. Πνεῦμα here is not the Holy Spirit, but the help of grace, the Spirit which we have received as a principle of eternal life. It is the effect produced in us by the Holy Spirit—not the Holy Spirit Himself. By that “Spirit,” then, we must slay (θανατοῦτε, which = *mortificatis* rather than *mortificaveritis*)¹ the “intrigues,” the “doings” of the flesh.

The Vulgate renders τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος by *facta carnis*; but the reading σώματος is certain.

Ζήσσεσθε refers to eternal life, as ἀποθνήσκειν does to eternal death. It is to be noted here that Paul does not teach that sinners shall not be raised up in the Resurrection, but only that they will not share in the eternal life of which the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is a pledge.

Commentators call attention to the oxymorons in *v.* 13: through life to death: through death to life.

(4) *The Spiritual as children and heirs of God* 14-17.

Paul's reasoning in this section seems to be somewhat like this: Those who are guided in all their conduct by the Spirit of God are truly Sons of God; and obviously those that “slay the ‘intrigues’ (the ‘doings,’ ‘workings’) of the body” are so guided. But those who are God's sons will also be His heirs (*i.e.*, will attain eternal life). Hence if we destroy the intrigues of the body, we shall attain eternal life. The γάρ in *v.* 14 shows that what follows is a proof of the statement in *v.* 13: “If ye slay by the Spirit the ‘intrigues’ of the Flesh, ye shall live.” Verses 15 and 16 are a sort of parenthesis, proving that Christians are Sons of God from the filial love which finds expression in their cry of “Father!”, and from the testimony of the Holy Spirit.

14. In the concrete the destroying of the “intrigues” of the body by the spirit is practically the same as surrender to the guidance of the Spirit.

The passive (ἄγονται) emphasises the strength of the Spirit's influence, but, of course, does not exclude the co-operation of the πνευματικός (which is implied in *v.* 13); the moving impulse of the Spirit does not destroy our freedom. Augustine puts himself the difficulty: “We are moved, do we not move?” and replies: *Immo et agis et ageris, et tunc bene agis si a bono ageris; Spiritus enim Dei, qui te agit, agenti adjutor est tibi* (Serm. 156, 11).

¹ WW. read *mortificatis*.

Instead of the πνεύματι of v. 13, we have here—more definitely—πνεύματι θεοῦ, perhaps, because of the reference to the “Sons of God.”

The divine Sonship in question is not the Sonship assigned in the Old Testament to Israel, or to pious Israelites: it is not a mere intimacy of friendship with God, but a participation in the divine nature: by the infusion of sanctifying grace we become θεῖας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως (2 Pet. i. 4).

Paul does not say here that the communication of the Spirit makes us Sons of God, but that they (and only they) who are guided by God's Spirit are the true Sons of God (Cf. Gal. iv. 6).

The text varies here: (a) υἱοὶ εἰσιν θεοῦ; (b) υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν; (c) εἰσιν υἱοὶ θεοῦ: (a) is regarded as best by Lagrange; Vogels has (c).

15. Paul now goes on to prove that Christians are really sons of God. Possibly he is meeting the objection of a doubting Christian, who might be tempted to say: “I see little reason for regarding myself as a Son of God, for I am now as I was before baptism—still in misery and wretchedness, and I find it so difficult to avoid sinning, that I doubt whether I have the Spirit you speak of!”

The Spirit which Paul's readers received in the rebirth of Baptism was not like that of the Jews of old—a spirit of servile fear, making them again, as formerly, walk in constant fear of God. The “Spirit” they have received is explained by some commentators as the disposition of mind produced by sanctifying grace, or by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Others take it as the Holy Spirit. It seems rather strange to speak, even negatively, of the Holy Spirit as a Spirit of slavery, and it is probably better to take πνεῦμα, in this verse, as a disposition or attitude of our minds.

A πνεῦμα δουλείας is the spirit that makes one a slave. Paul's readers have not received a spirit like that—so as to relapse into their pre-Christian attitude of fear: πάλιν is to be read with εἰς φόβον (= εἰς τὸ πάλιν φοβείσθαι). Rather have they received a πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας: this “Spirit” is a supernatural gift of disposition, or attitude, a sense divinely imparted to us of filial adoption. This is such a disposition as a grateful and affectionate adopted child would have towards the father who has adopted it—a spirit of confidence, and trust, and love.¹ In v. 16 the Holy Spirit seems to be definitely marked off from the human “spirit” (= the Christian elevated by grace), and a confirmation is thus

¹ Cf. 2 Tim. i. 7, where Paul speaks of the πνεῦμα which Timothy received at ordination—οὐ πνεῦμα δειλίας, ἀλλὰ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ σωφρονισμοῦ.

provided for the view that the πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας is the supernatural disposition of God's adopted sons.

The "spirit" of a Christian is not that of a slave, who goes in constant dread of his master, but of a son who loves his father. The spirit of slavish fear towards God was not a mark of Judaism only: it was also common among the heathens (*cf.* Gal. iv. 8 f.; Heb. xii. 18; Acts xvii. 22), so that the Romans would realise from their own experience what Paul meant by the contrast between the spirit of slavery and the spirit of adopted sons.

In the spirit of υιοθεσία—*i.e.*, as genuine adopted sons—we cry out to God *Abba!* Paul is keenly conscious of his own filial attitude to God, and, therefore, unites himself here with his readers in the cry ("We cry!") of "Father!" The ὁ πατήρ is merely the translation of the Aramaic, *Abba*. This primitive address—*Abba*, was consecrated for early Christians by the practice of Our Lord (*cf.* Mark xiv. 36), and hence was maintained in use (*Cf.* Gal. iv. 6). Gut. thinks that Paul, in writing this, had the *Pater Noster* in mind. Lagrange regards that opinion as unfounded.

Υιοθεσία is the technical designation for the adoption which gives all the rights of a son. Here it means the situation resulting from adoption.

The earnestness, confidence, and love with which we cry out "Father!" to God is a proof that we are really His children. The intense consciousness of adoption finds expression in the cry "*Abba!*"

16. The Holy Spirit gives testimony along with our spirit that we are God's children. The exegetes differ in explaining how the Holy Spirit joins His testimony to our spirit. Some explain that the Holy Spirit joins, as it were, in our cry of "*Abba!*" and we thus get the comforting assurance that we are indeed τέκνα (more intimate than υἱοί) of God. Aquinas says: *Reddit [Spiritus Sanctus] testimonium per affectum amoris filialis quem in nobis facit.* Bard. regards the testimony as the sweetness of consolation and exaltation which is given to us at times by the Holy Spirit. Chrysostom says that the Holy Spirit has given us the charism by which we cry out "*Abba!*" and that the Holy Spirit cries out "*Abba!*" along with us. The Vulgate should be corrected by suppressing *enim* (with WW.); and *testimonium reddit spiritui nostro* ought to be *testatur una* (*contestatur*) *cum spiritu nostro*.

The simplest and best explanation of v. 16 seems to be that the Holy Spirit joins with us in crying "*Abba!*" and thus corroborates our own consciousness of being God's

children.¹ Note how there is here no question of mere υιοθεσία, but of being τέκνα θεοῦ. Our Sonship to God is not a mere legal condition—for τέκνα expresses even more strongly than υιοί genuine Sonship. Our Sonship is based on our supernatural union with Christ, by which we become "sharers in the divine nature."

The "Spirit" with which the Holy Spirit "co-testifies" is the higher or supernatural self of the Christian—our soul as elevated by grace.

It is not to be assumed, of course, that Christians can be infallibly certain through the testimony of the Holy Spirit of actual Sonship to God. Even Paul had to maintain a constant struggle with himself, smiting and subjecting his body lest, having preached to others, he might himself be found "not to have stood the test" (1 Cor. ix. 26 f.: cf. 1 Cor. iv. 4.²)

17. If, then, we are children of God we are heirs of God and coheirs of Christ (Cf. Gal. iv. 7).

With "heir" we may compare the Hebrew יֶרֶשׁ, which means to occupy, and possess, as well as to inherit. Paul means that, as children of God, we shall share in the glory of God. But to enter into that glory we must, like Jesus (Luke xxiv. 26) suffer. That is the law of the Christian life: but the Christian rejoices in tribulation (as Paul has taught in V. 3), and the tribulation is outweighed immeasurably by the reward that is to come (v. 18. Cf. the Beatitudes, Matth. v. 4, 10 f.). Christ is "Heir of all things" (Heb. i. 1), and, as His brethren, we are co-heirs with Him. Ἐπεὶ = if, as is the case. The purpose of our suffering with Christ is (ἵνα) that we should be glorified with Him. This reference to our suffering is at once an apology for the difficulties of the Christian life, and a promise of our future glory (Cf. 1 Pet. iv. 13).

The ἵνα indicates the necessary connection between our suffering with Christ, and our sharing in His glory.

Lagrange thinks that the clause 17b is introduced to explain why we do not share at once, as brethren of the Risen Christ, in the glory of God. If we are to be full co-heirs with Christ we must suffer with Him. To all His brethren He has pointed out the Way of the Cross.

¹ Cf. Gal. iv. 6: ὅτι δὲ ἔστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν κρᾶζον Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ.

² Cf. Trent, Sess. VI, *De Justif.*, c. 9: *Nam sicut nemo pius de Dei misericordia, de Christi merito, deque Sacramentorum virtute et efficacia dubitare debet: sic quilibet, dum se ipsum suamque propriam infirmitatem et indispositionem respicit, de sua gratia formidare et timere potest cum nullus scire valeat certitudine fidei, cui non potest subesse falsum, se gratiam Dei esse consecutum.*

(5) *Universal hope of glory.* 18-25

18. Paul has just said that suffering with Christ is the necessary precondition of being glorified with Christ. Now he goes on to say that he is firmly convinced (λογίζομαι) that all the sufferings (παθήματα) of the present time, of this world, are of no account in comparison with the glory that shall be made manifest for us (εἰς ἡμᾶς—it will reach unto us), or in us. Λογίζομαι does not suggest any such meaning as “I feel sure,” or “I assume”: it indicates certain knowledge. (Cf. iii. 28; 2 Cor. xi. 5). In iii. 28 λογίζομεθα is rendered by the Vulgate *arbitramur*: here and in 2 Cor. xi. 5 λογίζομαι appears as *existimo*. It has been conjectured that Paul uses the first person singular here because he is about to advance reasons for his view which are unfamiliar to his readers.

“This time” is either “the present,” or the present world, and the sufferings are primarily the tribulations of the Christian life. The comparative insignificance of these sufferings is strongly stated in 2 Cor. iv. 17: “This present so trivial tribulation of ours procures for us a treasure of glory, great beyond all measure, and everlasting.”

Οὐκ ἄξια = are not deserving of consideration (Vulgate *non condignæ*). Πρὸς = in comparison with: μέλλουσιν implies the certainty of the coming manifestation (cf. Gal. iii. 23): the sense is: πρὸς τὴν δόξαν τὴν μέλλουσιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς. In the εἰς ἡμᾶς is probably conveyed the thought that the future glory, which is now hidden, and shall be revealed, will be poured out upon us, “when we shine like the sun in the Kingdom of Our Father” (Matth. xiv. 43). The “revelation” implies the idea of publicly imparting the glory.

At present we know not “what God has in store for those that love Him” (1 Cor. ii. 9): the “glory” in question is therefore future: but it is certain, and Paul now sets forth a number of reasons for regarding it as certain:

(a) The obscure longing of all created things (19-22); (b) our own sighs of hope (23-25); (c) the intercession of the Holy Spirit; (d) the divine plans on our behalf, which present us with the glory as a *fait accompli* (28-30).

19. The irrational creation longs for that glorification with anguished longing.

Ἀποκαρδοκία is a tense and longing expectation;¹ with the article it means the well-known, or admittedly existing expectation: ἡ ἀποκαρδοκία τῆς κτίσεως almost = ἡ ἀποκαρ-

¹ Waiting with head stretched forward. Cf. καρδοκεῖν.

δοκοῦσα κτίσις. Κτίσις seems to mean here irrational creation, in distinction from men (*Cf. v. 23*). The object of nature's longing is the "manifestation" (—i.e., the public and solemn manifestation of the glory) of the sons of God (*v. 18*).

With that glorification will come a better time for all creation, and creation feels and knows this already. Nature generally once shared in the fulness of grace and blessing that belonged to the primitive state: but it fell under a curse, because of Adam's Sin (*Gen. iii. 17*). When the effects of that sin have been completely undone, and our glory is shown forth, nature also will rejoice because the curse whose effects still weigh upon her, will then be utterly revoked. Thus even irrational nature will share in the glories of completed Redemption, and exult when Christ says to His chosen ones: "Come hither, ye blessed of My Father: take possession of the Kingdom which has been made ready for you since the creation of the world!"

Note that κτίσις is here personified, and that, to a certain extent, even the tense longing of κτίσις appears as a person.

20-21. Irrational nature, as a result of Adam's Sin, was made subject to ματαιότης (= vanity) as to a sort of ruler. In *v. 21* this subjection to "vanity" appears as a slavery to φθορά (destruction, corruption, decay—mutability in every form). The "Vanity" to which nature was subjected includes such aspects of nature as the barrenness of the earth, the daily struggle for existence, the evil of death, the fierce animosities of the brute creation, etc., etc. The "Vanity" may also include the unworthy and anti-religious uses to which nature has been put by fallen man in the service of idolatry (*cf. i. 25*: τὰ μάρματα = idols, *Acts xiv. 15*), avarice, pride, luxury, cruelty, etc. In this reference Estius adds: *Ad quam vanitatem hoc quoque pertinet, quod creatura, quæ in usum hominum venit, magna parte permissa est potestati principis hujus mundi*. It is not likely, however, that "Vanity" in this context contains a reference to the direct rule of Satan in the world.

Nature did not willingly (οὐχ ἐκούσα) become subject to "vanity": she was made subject to it—διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα—because He Who subjected it to mutability willed that nature should share with men both in blessing and malediction. The One Who subjected it is obviously God Who cursed it. It appears that the subjection to "vanity" involved the withdrawal of a freedom from "vanity," which nature possessed, not the denial to Nature of a freedom which *would have been given* if Adam had not sinned. The beauty, harmony, and teeming fulness of life, which characterised

the world that God had fashioned (Gen. i. 31), in great part vanished to make place for barrenness, strife, disorder, death, and corruptibility of every kind.

But even when submitting to the compulsion of God's curse, nature was not left without hope: it still retained the hope of regaining its freedom, and so it was subjected to "mutability" ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ("on the basis of hope," or "towards hope"): ¹ ἐπ' ἐλπίδι is to be joined with ὑπετάγη, not with ὑποτάξαντα.

Ὅτι, etc. (διότι in **NDG**: Vulgate *quia*). This clause gives the reason for the "hope" (according to some, less probably, the content of the hope).² Creation, too, is to be liberated from the slavery of corruption (= "Vanity"), and to be brought "to the freedom (εἰς ἐλευθερίαν) of the glory of God's sons." This does not mean, of course, that nature will receive the glory of God's sons, but that the freedom of God's sons will bring with it the release of nature from ματαιότης and φθορά. Nature longs for that release, and therefore longs for its pre-condition—the glorification of the sons of God. Commentators find in this liberation of nature from corruption the coming of the "new heaven" and the "new earth" of Isaias lxxv. 17 (and of Christian Apocalyptic Hope as expressed in 2 Pet. iii. 13; Apoc. xxi. 1). It is doubtful, however, whether Paul here wishes to insist on a positive glorification of nature, over and above its release from the primeval curse. As the "slavery of corruption" is the subjection of nature to corruption, so the "freedom of glory" is the freedom from that slavery which follows on the public glorification of God's sons. It is at the General Resurrection, when "Death is swallowed up in victory" (1 Cor. xv. 54), that the bondage of corruption will be for ever removed.

22. Οἶδμεν γὰρ, etc.: All Christians would know the doctrine of the Fall and what it implied: they would also know how the disorder induced by the Fall was ultimately to be overcome (Acts iii. 21; 2 Pet. iii. 12 f.). What the faithful knew from Christian teaching they can observe with their own senses. Nature sighs and groans because of the slavery of corruption. Even up to the present moment all nature joins in a chorus of groaning. All nature writhes in pain (συνωδίνει) —in pain like the pangs of childbirth.³ The συν—in

¹ WW's text has *in spem*.

² The repetition of κτίσις in καὶ αὐτῇ ἡ κτίσις supports the causal rendering of ὅτι (and helps to corroborate διότι).

³ If we read with Vulgate *parturit* = δδύει. But this reading is probably a corruption of ὥδύει, which itself arose from συνωδίνει.

συνοστενάζει and συνωδίνει emphasises the universality of the sorrows which nature endures: *all* nature groans and suffers pangs together.

The groaning and suffering of all nature continue, ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν—even into the Christian period: with the *Parousia* the complete renewal of nature will begin.

23. Paul now passes on to another reason for the certainty of our future glory.

Not merely irrational creatures, but we men also, look with painfully eager longing for the full glory of the sons of God. We groan also in the depths of our spirits (ἐν ἑαυτοῖς)¹ even we (read, καὶ αὐτοί, or καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοί) though (or, because) we possess the Holy Spirit, as the first fruits (ἀπαρχή) of the divine Sonship. We possess the first fruits which are the Holy Spirit (appositional Genitive): that is, the grace which we possess through Baptism is a prelude to, and a pledge of, glory. The "first-fruits" are not thought of as a first instalment of a glory to be more fully received; but the Holy Spirit is a pledge and guarantee of glory. Cf. the ἀρραβὼν τοῦ πνεύματος in 2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5; Eph. i. 14.

The καὶ αὐτοί are not the Apostles merely, but all the regenerate, as distinguished from the κτίσις of vv. 19-22.

Ἐχόντες can be rendered "although we possess" (concessive), or "because we possess": the causal rendering would put emphasis on ἀπεκδεχόμενοι.

The υἰοθεσία which is looked for, is the full and secure possession of divine Sonship.¹ The faithful will attain to this when they rise from the dead, and their bodies are glorified. This is implied in "redemption of our body." Aquinas says: *Incohata est hujusmodi adoptio per Spiritum Sanctum justificantem animam . . . consummabitur autem per ipsius corporis glorificationem . . . Ut sicut spiritus noster redemptus est a peccato, ita corpus nostrum redimatur a corruptione et morte.* (Cf. Phil. iii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 51; 2 Cor. v. 2 ff.). The ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος does not mean "redemption from the body"—as if the body were something essentially evil. Such an idea is definitely out of harmony with Pauline teaching.² At present the Spirit is life, and the body is dead, but when the υἰοθεσία is perfect, the body also will be released from mutability: it also will

¹ Aquinas explains: *Ex interiori cordis affectu procedit . . . et . . . est propter interiora bona.*

² The ordinary Vulgate text reads here *filiorum Dei*. WW. omit *Dei*.

It is only as identified with "flesh" that our body is something to be put off. Cf. 2 Cor. v. 2.

be glorified. Hence we, looking forward to this glorification of our bodies, join in the chorus of nature's sighing.

24-25. Τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν, etc. : The τῇ ἐλπίδι may mean, (a) for hope (dative of advantage), (b) through hope (instrumental dative), (c) as to hope—i.e. (*dativus modi*), in hoping fashion.

Gut. accepts (a) and explains "for this hope"—i.e., the glorification of our bodies is a "hope" in the sense of an object of hope; and for this object of hope, or unto the attainment of this object of hope, we have become participant in salvation through faith and baptism. As, according to Paul, we are saved by faith, not by hope, (b) is not in the spirit of Pauline teaching. Bard. and Lagrange accept (c) : we are already redeemed and justified and, in so far, saved; but we still hope for redemption, since the body still looks for redemption. The sense is then, that we are saved in a hoping fashion—but not yet fully in reality.

A thing that is hoped for must still be absent and invisible. If a thing is present and fully visible, it cannot be an object of hope : a "visible object of hope" is not a genuine object of hope!

The reading of the clause ὁ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει is uncertain.

The following variants occur :

- (1) ὁ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ὑπομένει;
- (2) „ τις καὶ ὑπομένει;
- (3) „ τις ἐλπίζει;
- (4) „ τις καὶ ἐλπίζει;
- (5) „ τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει;
- (6) „ τις, τί ἐλπίζει.

From these variants, looked at in the light of their sources, Lietzmann establishes τις, τί καὶ ὑπομένει, as the primitive text, from which all the others can be derived. The sense of all the readings is substantially the same. What need has a man still to expect what he directly beholds? *Spes est expectatio futuri* (Aquinas), and that which is immediately present and visible, is not *futurum*.

But the Christian does not behold the glory which is prepared for him. It is in the future. Hope, steadfast and patient, is an essential feature of the Christian life. The confident, patient hope of final glory is itself a guarantee of attaining that glory; and nothing, therefore, should be permitted to lessen the dogged steadfastness of our Christian hope.

(6) *The Holy Spirit—our Helper in prayer.* VIII, 26-27

26. Ὠσαύτως, etc.: As we sigh together with irrational nature, so does the indwelling Holy Spirit help our weakness by helping us in our prayers, and sighing with us for the glory which is to come.¹

In the patient hopeful waiting, and longing of the Christ an life the Holy Spirit, Whom we have received as "first-fruits," or "pledge" of salvation, graciously comes to the help of our weakness. Often in times of trouble we do not rightly know what God would have us ask for in prayer, or how He would have us to pray. As Aquinas says: *In generali quidem possumus scire quid convenienter oremus, sed in speciali hoc non possumus scire.* In this uncertainty as to how or what precisely we ought to pray, the Holy Spirit Himself (αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα), Who dwells in us, comes to our help, and prays with us, and through us, by inspiring us with unutterable sighings. *In nobis gemit (Spiritus Sanctus) quia nos gemere facit* (Augustine). Every due and suitable prayer that we utter in the abnormal seasons referred to, is produced in us by the Holy Spirit. Paul is obviously not speaking here of ordinary prayer, but of extraordinary and unusual prayer—of mystic prayer, apparently, of which it can be said (as of the name written on the stone in Apoc. ii. 17) ὁ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ λαμβάνων. With this gift of mystic or ecstatic prayer should be compared the charism of tongues.

The ὑπὲρ in ὑπερεντυγχάνει implies that the Holy Spirit prays in our stead.² The sighings which He evokes in us are "unspeakable" because we cannot put them into clear words. But they are, nevertheless, in effect, prayers pleasing to God.

27. The "unspeakable groans" are fully understood by God—because He is the "Searcher of hearts."³ The Searcher of hearts knows (with approval) what the Holy Spirit has in view—the φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος. Men's hearts are often unintelligible to the men themselves, but not to God; He sees them through and through, for πάντα γυμνά καὶ τετραχλισμένα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ (Heb. iv. 13).

God and the Holy Spirit are one in nature, and hence God must know the purpose of the Holy Spirit when He prays in and through us. Furthermore, it is clear that the Holy

¹ The Ὠσαύτως can scarcely refer back to vv. 15-16—as if the sense were: As the Spirit cries in us "Abba!" so also does He help us in prayer.

² The word ὑπερεντυγχάνειν is a purely Pauline formation taking the place of ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ (with genitive).

³ For this epithet of God, cf. Ps. vii. 10; Jer. xvii. 10, etc., etc.

Spirit can only pray "for the Saints" according to God's designs and wishes (κατὰ θεόν = "according to the will of God").

The "Saints" are those who are in sanctifying grace, and who, therefore, enjoy the indwelling of the Spirit. The object of the sighing which the Holy Spirit evokes is "redemption of the body" (v. 23), heavenly glory (cf. 2 Cor. v. 2 ff.), union with Christ (Phil. i. 23).

(7) *The Divine Call to Salvation.* VIII, 28-30

28. A fourth ground of the certainty of our hope of glory is the special love that God has already manifested towards us. The love of God is a token of election to salvation—because all things, including difficulties, conspire unto good for those that love God; or (according to the reading of A and B, πάντα συνεργεῖ ὁ θεός) God helps in all things (πάντα = ἐν πᾶσιν) unto good those that love Him. The "good" is real good or advantage—the increase of grace, and intensification of glory.

This is so because those that love God are those that are "called according to decree"—i.e., predetermined by God to be called. The τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεόν are taken up again in τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν (= "because they are just those who have been called").

The πρόθεσις is the divine decree or purpose: θεοῦ can be added in thought from the preceding clause. From the context it would seem that the κλητοί are primarily those who were called to faith and grace, and indirectly those who were called to glory in heaven. Paul means that those who love God and who therefore have been called to grace, are, speaking generally, sure of attaining to salvation. Verse 29 makes it clear that Paul regards salvation as normally implied in the call to faith and grace.

29. Those whom God foreknew He also predetermined to be made like the image of His Son, so that His Son should be the first-born of many brethren. Paul here indicates the various stages in the process of men's salvation. The whole process begins and ends with God. God's foreknowing the elect is the first stage. In this foreknowing a special interest is included which makes it an act of divine election. But Paul leaves the question untouched whether this election is *ante* or *post praevisa merita*.

The second stage is the predetermining of the "fore-known," not to faith or grace merely, but to blessedness (*prædestinatio ad gloriam*), for, being made like the image

of His Son implies being "conglorified" with the Son—glorified, that is, after the manner of the glorified humanity of Christ (*Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 49; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Phil. iii. 21).

"That He should be the first-born among many brethren," expresses a purpose rather than a result. Christ was the first of our race to pass from among the dead unto glorification (*cf.* Col. i. 18): following Him many were to be clad with the glory of God's Sons, and in their glorification the glorification of Christ would, as it were, be intensified.

30. The "brethren" are the same as the "foreknown" and predetermined. We have here the third stage in the process of salvation—the effective call to the faith. With this third stage practically coincides the fourth—justification (*Cf.* i. 17; iii. 21-30).

Those whom God predetermined He called, and those whom He called He justified.

The "calling" is the effective call to the Faith (*Cf.* John vi. 44).

The Christian whom God has justified will surely enter into the fifth, and final stage of salvation—eternal blessedness.

The verbs ἐκόλεσεν and ἐδικαίωσεν refer to the past, for Paul is thinking of Christians who are in the state of grace. Ἐδόξασεν is a proleptic aorist—anticipating the future for vividness, and conveying the thought of the complete certainty of the event. There is also a sense in which "has glorified" may be regarded as referring, like "has called" and "has justified," to the past. The genuine Christian possesses within him, even here below, eternal blessedness in principle: or, as it has been put, "Grace is Glory in exile; Glory is Grace at home."

The divine call to faith and grace is, then, indicative of a call to glory, since in fact the whole process of attaining glory is already complete in principle in the genuine Christian. It is not, of course, a point of Pauline teaching that all Christians are saved, or that those who are called, are merely passive instruments in God's hand. Vigorous and unflagging co-operation with divine grace is absolutely necessary on the part of the Christian who is to be saved.

(8) *The Certainty of Salvation—A Hymn.* VIII, 31-39

31. After all that has been said about God's loving pre-election and pre-determination to blessedness in verses 28-30, what are we to say?

We can only say that since God guards and guides us nothing can imperil our salvation. No one can do aught

against the chosen of God ! (Cf. John x. 28-29). The world may hate them, but it cannot prevent their salvation.

32. How precious we are in God's sight is shown by the price at which He ransomed us. He gave up to death (παρέδωκεν) His own real, only-begotten Son, for us *all* (for all men). Having given us so much God cannot refuse to give us with His Son all else (τὰ πάντα)—all that is needed for our salvation. Chrysostom says here : " If God has given the greater thing to His enemies how shall He not give the lesser to His friends ? " In comparison with the gift of His Son everything else is insignificant.

33. Here the " Who is against us ? " is developed.

Who is to bring a charge against the Elect of God ?

Θεὸς ὁ δικαίων may be a question answering a question : " Is it God that justifies (= acquits) that will raise a charge ? " The answer to this would, of course, be in the negative. But it is, perhaps, better to take θεὸς ὁ δικαίων as a statement : " It is God that justifies." (i.e., acquits Cf. v. 30).¹

But if God justifies the Elect, who then will condemn them (τίς ὁ κατακρινών) ? The only one that can come in question is Jesus Christ, and He has done, and continues to do, everything possible to save us from condemnation. He died to free us from sin : He was raised up unto everlasting life that we might live in Him (Cf. vi. 4 f.). He sits at the right hand of God in eternal glory, holding the sceptre of world-dominion, and yet always acting as our High Priest and Intercessor with God (Eph. i. 20 ; Heb. viii. 1). How could such a one condemn us ? Will He not rather intercede for us with the Father ?

35. What power, then,² can separate us from the love of Christ for us ? There are many things, it is true, that might interfere with our love for Christ—things that might lead the faint-hearted Christian to doubt and lose courage. But neither calamity nor anguish nor persecution, nor hunger nor nakedness nor danger, nor the sword nor any other difficulty of the Christian life, should turn away the Christian from his Lord.³

36. The trials and afflictions of Christians Paul sees foreshadowed in the sufferings of the Covenant People of the Old Testament as depicted in Ps. xliii. 22.

¹ The Isaian text (Is. 1. 8, 9) which Paul has in view in v. 33 seems to support the view that θεὸς ὁ δικαίων ought to be taken as a statement : ὅτι ἐγγίζει ὁ δικαίωσός με—*karobh masdiki*.

² τίς is used either on account of the questions in v. 33, or in order to personify the difficulties and obstacles about to be named.

³ WW. have here the order of the Greek.

37. But (ἀλλά referring to *v.* 36) in all these trials and persecutions we are more than victors (ὑπερνικῶμεν), for the trials only increase our strength and courage: we boast of them (*v.* 3: *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 16). We overcome our afflictions "through Him that loved us"—through the love and grace of Christ. The aorist participle points primarily to the great Sacrificial act of love on Calvary. From his own experience Paul is convinced (πέπεισμαι) that no creature can separate us from God's love—Neither Death, with its terrors, nor Life with its seductions: Neither powers of heaven (ἄγγελοι) nor powers of earth (ἄρχαί):¹ nor aught connected with time—whether things present or things to come; nor any impersonal powers hostile to man (δυνάμεις) whether of Height or Depth (perhaps above, or below the earth); nor any other creature—can separate us from that love of God which has revealed itself in Jesus Christ and has been given to us in Him.

All powers of the universe are helpless, then, against that intensity of divine love which revealed itself in the Sacrifice of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

This outburst of triumphal confidence in the all-conquering influence of the divine charity which manifested itself on Calvary, is a fitting close to the proof that the "Gospel is a power of God unto salvation for everyone that believes" (i. 16).

V. GOD'S PROVIDENCE TOWARDS ISRAEL. IX, 1-XI, 36²

In the long section, i, 18-viii. 39, Paul has proved the first half of i. 16: "The Gospel is a power of God unto salvation for everyone that believes": he now goes on to discuss the second part of that verse, "For the Jew first and for the heathen."

Paul speaks here as a Jew who loves his people and is grieved to the heart at their rejection of Christ in spite of their glorious past. He shows that this rejection in nowise defeats the counsels of God: indeed it only makes them clearer and more intelligible. The Israel of the Patriarchal promises is seen not to be the Israel of carnal descent, but an Israel of promise, "born of the will of God." And in choosing some and rejecting others God is absolutely and

¹ WW. omit *neque virtutes*, and substitute *fortitudines* for *fortitudo*.

² For excellent recent discussions of the problems of ix.-xi., see Charue, *L'incrédulité des Juifs dans le Nouveau Testament* (Gembloux, Duculot, 1929), and Maier, *Israel in der Heilsgeschichte nach Röm. ix.-xi.* (Münster, Aschendorff, 1929).

utterly free and untrammelled, and quite undetermined by the actions of men. If, then, His attitude towards different men is different, He has not to give reckoning thereon. The whole teaching of Scripture and Hebrew History emphasises the sovereign freedom and utter independence of God in His control of men.

The rejection of Israel and the reception of the Gentiles in the New Testament period is in harmony with that utter freedom of God. It may not be criticised. Furthermore, it was already clearly foreshadowed in the Old Testament that the Gentiles would be called, and that only a portion of the Jews would prove loyal.

But the failure of Israel as a people is the fault of the nation itself. It propped itself up on works, and failed to realise the justice of faith—though that was clearly foreshadowed in the Sacred Books. The unbelieving Jews have no excuse for their unbelief. They have had the Gospel preached to them. God has sought them out, but they have rejected His advances.

Yet it would be false to say that Israel has been altogether rejected. As it was in the ancient days, so it is even now; there is a loyal remnant among the people. Moreover, the failure of Israel has brought success and happiness to the Gentiles. The Gospel was made known *first to the Jew*, and the speedy refusal of the Jew has opened the way to the Gentile Mission. But Gentiles must not boast over Jewish failure: they are merely branches engrafted on the ancient venerable olive that is Israel, and they may be lopped off again.

The partial failure of Israel is part of God's plan for the conversion of the world, and when the world-mission of the Gospel is completed, and all the Gentiles, whom God has called, have entered into His Kingdom, the Jews as a people will also enter in. To the inscrutable wisdom of God, which reveals itself in the course of Jewish history, Paul finally chants a hymn of wonder, praise, and thanks.

(a) THE FREEDOM OF THE DIVINE ELECTION. IX, 1-29

(1) *Paul's grief at the rejection of his people.* IX, 1-5

1. Note the contrast between the sadness here and the jubilation of chapter viii. Probably Paul was often accused of disloyalty to his own people, and some such charge may account for the vehemence of his present grief.

He speaks the truth "in Christ"—*i.e.*, as one who is in union with Christ: the expression is not an oath.

"I lie not," strengthens the positive assertion (*Cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 17). His conscience bears him out "in the Holy Spirit," *i.e.*, at the impulse and direction of the Holy Spirit, or in union with the Holy Spirit (in that state of grace which is incompatible with disloyalty to the truth): ἐν Πνεύματι Ἀγίῳ is to be read with the participle συναρτυρούσης. Theophylact says that Paul appeals here to three witnesses—Christ, his own conscience, and the Holy Spirit.

- 2-3. His sorrow for the obduracy of his people is so intense because of his love.¹ Because of that love he would be ready, if it were possible and in accordance with God's will, to purchase the salvation of his own people at the sacrifice of his own: ἡψόμην is for ἡψόμην ἄν; it expresses a wish which cannot be fulfilled.² *Optarem* would be better in the Vulgate than *optabam*

Ἀνάθεμα (the Hellenistic form for ἀνάθημα) is used to translate *herem* in the LXX—*i.e.*, a thing banned, or devoted to destruction, a thing accursed. Here³ we must read ἀνάθεμα with ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ in the sense "shut out from union with Christ." Obviously union with Christ is for Paul an advantage incomparably greater than any other: hence he cannot mean that he would really give it up for the sake of his brethren. At the most, the anathema and separation from Christ could only be understood of external exclusion from fellowship with Christ—if that were possible, without exclusion from the love and grace of Christ. By asserting his willingness to do the impossible Paul wishes to emphasise the intensity of his desire to save his brethren.

Αὐτὸς ἐγὼ = "I who am regarded as the enemy of my people": ὑπέρ = "instead of," or "to the advantage of." The "brethren" are the still incredulous Jews.

4. Paul's grief is all the greater because of the great spiritual privileges that his people have enjoyed. He enumerates the most striking of those privileges.⁴

(a) They are *Israelites*—*i.e.*, bearers of the glorious name which marks them off as God's specially chosen and

¹ Note the three climaxes:

λύπη—δύση;
μεγάλη—ἀδιόλπιτος;
μοί—τῇ καρδίᾳ μου.

² In Exod. xxxii. 32, Moses prays: "Forgive them their sin; if not, blot me out of Thy Book which Thou hast written." This prayer could only be granted if it was God's will to grant it—and that is not the case.

³ At a later period a distinction was made between ἀνάθημα, a votive offering, and ἀνάθεμα a thing accursed.

⁴ "Οτινες = *quippe qui*—"inasmuch as they are."

privileged people (*Cf.* Gen. xxxii. 28 ; Eccli. xvii. 15 ; Gal. vi. 16).

- (b) They have the "adoption of sons"—*i.e.*, their election as God's own people (*Cf.* Exod. iv. 22 ; Deut. xiv. 1 ; xxxii. 6 ; Jer. xxxi. 9).
 - (c) They have the "glory"—the manifestation of God in the pillar of cloud (Exod. xvi. 10 ; xxiv. 16, etc. ; Ezech. i. 28 ; Heb. ix. 5) ; the *Shekinah* of Rabbinical Theology.
 - (d) The "Covenants"—the Covenants made with the Patriarchs, and the Sinaitic Covenant (*Cf.* Gen. vi. 18 ; ix. 9 ff. ; xv. 18 ; xvii. 2 ff. ; Exod. xix. 5 ; xxxi. 16 ; xxxiv. 10 ; Lev. xxvi. 42. In Wisd. xviii. 22 ; 2 Macc. viii. 15, we hear of the "Covenants of the Fathers"). WW. read *testamenta*.
 - (e) The Legislation—*i.e.*, the Mosaic Code.
 - (f) The Cult—*i.e.*, the divine service in the Tabernacle and the Temple, as ordered in the Law. (The "Sayings of the Fathers" (i. 2) makes the world to rest on three things—the Law, the Cult ('*abhodhah*), and the practice of almsgiving.)
 - (g) The Promises—*i.e.*, the Messianic promises (*Cf.* iii. 1 ; iv. 14 ff.).
5. (h) The Fathers—the Patriarchs to whom the Messianic promises were given—primarily, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.
- (i) From them is the Messiah, according to the flesh—the greatest prerogative of all. The $\tau\acute{o}$ in $\tau\acute{o}$ κατὰ σάρκα is intended for emphasis : it also suggests the other side of Christ's being—according to which He is the All-ruling God.¹

The Doxology is (as in i. 25, and in 2 Cor. xi. 31) a thanksgiving for the graces granted to Israel, and, at the same time, an act of atonement on Paul's part for the incredulity of the Jews. 'Ο ὦν = ὃς ἔστιν : the reference is to Christ, The whole phrase ὁ ὦν . . . ἀμήν is to be taken together, and not so divided as to make the reference to Christ end with πάντων ; Christ is "God blessed for ever." A doxology to the Father is not in place here, and it is much more natural—as it is more in harmony with tradition—to refer the whole of verse 5 to Christ. Lagrange remarks that θεός here is almost an adjective (meaning "divine in nature").

¹ WW. omit *est* : *ex quibus Christus*.

The passage is a clear and definite assertion of the divinity of Christ, and, for that reason, has been variously twisted by modern critics. Some have insisted on breaking up the verse at πάντων, and beginning a new clause with θεός. Others have argued from Pauline custom that a provokingly definite emphasis on Christ's divinity is not to be accepted here unless it can be shown to be inevitable. Others have suggested changes in the text, such as, ὧν ὁ instead of ὁ ὧν. There is, however, no authority for any change in the text, and there is no valid reason for questioning the traditional view of verse 5.

(2) *Carnal descent cannot ensure Salvation.* IX, 6-13

6. Οὐχ οἶον δέ, etc. : There is here a sort of fusion of οὐχ οἶον and οὐχ ὅτι—"It is not as if" (or "I will not say that") God's Word has failed. God's Word includes all the Messianic Prophecies. These prophecies have not failed because the majority of the Jews are incredulous, for the "Israel" for which the promises were intended is not the whole carnal posterity of Abraham. Though the Law may fail, the Promise cannot fail. The "Israel" of the Promise is a spiritual Israel—so that carnal descent from Abraham is not of itself a token of the genuine Israelite. Not all who belong to the nation Israel (or who are descendants of Jacob), are genuine Israelites.
7. Οὐδ' ὅτι εἰσιν σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, πάντες τέκνα : this has been variously construed : (a) And because they are the seed of Abraham, they are not all children (i.e., true children of Abraham). (b) Gut. reads οὐδ' ὅτι εἰσιν σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ with the foregoing : "For not all who are sprung from the Patriarch Jacob constitute Israel—nor because they (as they think) are the Seed of Abraham, are they the genuine Israel." With πάντες Gut. begins a new sentence : "All indeed are children, but (Scripture says) : 'In Isaac there will be a seed named for thee.'"

Practically all modern exegetes accept (a), and render v. 7 : "Nor because they are the posterity of Abraham are they all (his genuine) children." The ordinary Vulgate text reads *neque qui semen*, instead of *neque quia semen*. WW. read *quia*. All his carnal descendants are Abraham's posterity, but, according to Scripture, it was only through Isaac that Abraham was to have a posterity in which the promises would be fulfilled. Not Ishmael, but Isaac, was to be the true "Seed" of Abraham : ἐν Ἰσαάκ may possibly be taken

instrumentally, "Through (the name) Isaac shall a seed be named for thee"—i.e., "Thy seed will be called Isaac." However the ἐν is understood, the sense is clear: the greatness promised to Abraham was to be fulfilled in the stock of Isaac only. Thus, then, it is not the physical posterity of Abraham that is as such his genuine posterity. Something else is required for sonship to Abraham than fleshly descent. The stock of Isaac are the true posterity of Abraham because Isaac is a child of promise (as Gal. iv. 23 puts it)—born not according to the flesh, but according to the Promise (Gen. xviii. 10, 14).

The infidelity of the Israel according to the flesh proves, therefore, nothing against the promises of God. These promises were to be fulfilled in the Israel of promise, and those who are re-born to God in Christ are the children (the Israel) of promise, and in them the promises made to Abraham are, in fact, fulfilled. In Gal. iv. 21-23, Isaac is made the type of all who are justified by faith, and the present context should be read in the light of that passage.

8. This verse supplies the explanation of the second part of v. 7. It is not the fleshly descendants of Abraham that are, as such, sons of God, but the children of promise. Paul speaks here of "sons of God" rather than of sons of Abraham, because he is thinking of the inheritance of the Messianic blessings—one of which is the υἱοθεσία. The point which he wishes to emphasise is that it is the being born as the fulfilment of a promise, κατὰ Ἰσαάκ (Gal. iv. 28), that gives a guarantee of Sonship to God. The Jews might object to Paul that they were all sons of Isaac, and therefore children of promise, and heirs to the whole inheritance of blessing promised through Isaac—including divine sonship. Paul's answer to this would be that it rests with God alone to pre-elect to sonship, and that carnal descent, as such, gives no rights. Not merely is carnal descent from *Abraham*, as such, unavailing for salvation: carnal descent from *Isaac*, as such, is equally unavailing. To be a son of Isaac in the sense of the Promises one must have a birth like that of Isaac—not merely a birth according to promise, but a birth according to faith. Such a birth is the re-birth in Baptism. All this becomes more intelligible in the light of the contrast between those born κατὰ σάρκα and those born κατὰ πνεῦμα (= τέκνα ἐπαγγελίας) in the Galatian text already referred to (Gal. iv. 21-31).

The Vulgate *æstimantur in semine* ought to be *æstimantur in semen*: λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα means, "is reckoned as posterity."

9. This verse proves that Isaac was a child of promise (and a child, too, of Abraham's faith). Paul presupposes in his readers familiarity with the story of the birth of Isaac, and merely quotes the words of the Angel in Gen. xviii. 10, 14 : "I will return to thee at this time next year, and Sara will have a Son" (according to the Hebrew). The birth of Isaac, therefore, clearly was not according to the flesh, but was a miracle announced in a divine promise. In the quotation from Gen. xviii. two verses (10 and 14) are fused.
- 10-11. Against the possible Jewish objection that the Jews are the children of Isaac, and, therefore, ought all to share in the promised blessings, verse 10 is directed. Isaac had been chosen by God rather than Ishmael; but that was natural enough, since Ishmael was the son of a slave. The case of Jacob and Esau illustrates much better how utterly independent of natural conditions—such as carnal descent, is the choice of God. Jacob and Esau were sons of the same parents, and were at the same time in their mother's womb. Yet, like though the two were in all circumstances of birth, God chose Jacob rather than Esau, and chose him while he was still in the womb. The choice was not influenced, therefore, by any actual merit, or achievement, of Jacob : it depended solely on God's will. Altogether independent, then, of works or merit, as the choice of God was, it was a *πρόθεσις κατ' ἐκλογήν*. In His election God is determined only by His own plans.

Οὐ μόνον δέ: Bard. proposes to supply here the name Sara from *v.* 9, and to add some such phrase as, "has experienced this," or, "can testify to this." The Vulgate inserts *illa*.

Rebecca is left in the air, as it were, until she is implicitly mentioned again in the αὐτῇ of *v.* 12.

Ἐξ ἑνὸς κοίτην ἔχουσα. Lagrange explains κοίτη (which usually is a euphemism for the sexual act) as *semen emissum* (*cf.* Num. v. 20; Lev. xviii. 20, 23), and translates "Rebecca having also conceived of one man."

Instead of *concubitu* WW. read *concubitum*.¹ While in the case of Isaac and Ishmael there were two mothers, in the case of Jacob and Esau the parents are identical: the mother conceives from the one man—*viz.*, Isaac. There is, therefore, no natural reason for choosing one of the twins and rejecting the other.

The πρόθεσις κατ' ἐκλογήν was not to fail (ἐκπίπτειν, *v.* 6), but to have permanence (μένειν). The words "The older shall

¹ The verse is read by WW.: *Non solum autem sed et Rebecca ex uno concubitum habens Isaac patris nostri.*

serve the younger," were spoken to Rebecca (αὐτῇ) to make known the divine decree to men, and to keep it constantly before their eyes.

12. Οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ κολοῦντος may be taken as explaining the "purpose according to (free) choice," the divine decree to call men to the faith: that call to the faith is independent of all circumstances of birth or conditions of merit: it is a work of grace alone which cannot be merited (a "holy call," οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων, 2 Tim. i. 9). The predetermination here in question seems to be *ante prævisa merita*: it is, apparently, a predetermination rather to grace than to glory—to the grace of inclusion among the chosen children of God.

13. The Scripture quotations in v. 12 and v. 13, from Gen. xxv. 23 and Mal. i. 2 f., respectively, refer, in their contexts, primarily, to the descendants of Jacob and Esau—to the Israelites and Idumæans. Paul takes the words as spoken of the brothers themselves; the ancestor of the Idumæans has to do slave-service for the ancestor of the Israelites; and God has shown such intensity of love for Jacob, that by contrast, His attitude towards Esau might be regarded as one of hatred. God's attitude towards Esau could not, of course, be real hatred, for God hates nothing that He has created (*Cf.* Wisd. xi. 23).

The outcome of this discussion (6-13) is, then, that God has eternally chosen only a portion of the stock of Israel, and that the divine choice of that section has nothing to do with racial origins. Hence the incredulity of Israel in no way has disturbed God's plans.

(3) *In choosing and rejecting God is not unjust.* IX, 14-23

- 14-16. When God prefers one individual, and rejects another, without reference to merit or demerit, is He not unjust?

The answer is based on Exod. xxxiii. 19 (quoted according to the LXX). God claims this procedure as His right, and so it cannot be unjust. The calling of a man to grace depends, then, on God's decree alone. The matter in hand (v. 16), the calling of a man to grace, depends not on a man's own will, nor on his own striving, but on the gracious mercy of God alone.

Τρέχειν is derived from racing contests, and suggests the thought of striving towards a goal (*Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 24, where the effort of the Christian life itself is compared to such a

contest). The goal here is ἐλεείσθαι, or οἰκτείρεσθαι. The reception of grace depends then solely on God.

17. To make his point clearer Paul refers to another Old Testament text¹ in which God says that He has permitted the disobedience of Pharaoh, in order to display His own omnipotence, and to glorify His Name. The text (Exod. ix. 16) runs in the Masoretic recension: "For this I have maintained thee" (ךהעמדתי = "made thee to stand").² The LXX has: ἕνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθης. Different from both is Paul's: εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε. The Vulgate has taken ἐξήγειρα in the sense of "spurring on"—*excitavi*, and some of the older commentators explained ἐξήγειρα in that sense; making it thus practically equivalent to "I have hardened thee" (σκληρύνειν)—or, better, "I have allowed thee to become hardened." Cf. for a similar use of ἐξεγείρειν, 2 Macc. xiii. 4. The "hardening" of Pharaoh would be the result of the withholding of grace (*Non apponendo gratiam*. Aquinas).

Lagrange takes ἐξήγειρά σε, as = "I have set thee up" (Targum, *kaiyemtakh*), "I have given thee a rôle," "I have put thee on the world's stage."

Lagrange explains that, just as God raised up Moses to display His mercy, so He raised up Pharaoh to display through him His justice and severity. There is no hint that God raised up Pharaoh to manifest His own glory by damning Pharaoh. There is no question here of Pharaoh's final impenitence; but only of his opposition to God's will in this particular case. The outcome of Pharaoh's opposition was the manifestation of God's power, and the increase of His glory ("that My Name might be announced in all the world").

18. The general inference from the Old Testament texts in vv. 15, 17 is here stated. God's absolute freedom in conferring grace is the plain teaching of Scripture, and hence, there is no injustice in God's preference of one and rejection of another. The meaning of Paul is neither that God drove Pharaoh to evil, nor that He hardens all to whom He does not show mercy; but that God has the right to "harden" (*non apponendo gratiam*) whom He wills—whether for a time or always.

The whole context implies, further, that sinners really carry out the will of God when they oppose it. This must, there-

¹ "The Scripture says to Pharaoh" = "In Scripture God says to Pharaoh." Cf. Gal. iii. 8. 22. There is a contrast between, "To Pharaoh" here and, "To Moses" above (v. 15).

² Or, "I have preserved thee"—i.e., from the Plague.

fore, be true of the Jews when they oppose the Gospel (So, Lagrange).¹

19. But now an obvious difficulty arises: If God produces the hardening (σκληρύνειν), and if His influence is irresistible, how can He blame or punish those who are hardened and incredulous?

Μέμεται = (according to Hesychius) αἰτιᾶται, ἐξουθενεῖ, καταγινώσκει. Vulgate has *queritur* (WW.).² Why then does God chide the sinner, since no man can oppose His will? (Cf. xiii. 2).

20. The difficulty is not answered, but simply set aside. It rouses Paul to anger. "Thou mere man," he says, "who art thou that speakest back to (= contendest with) God? Why does not one rather (μενοῦνγε = *immo potius*) ask: Shall that which is fashioned say to him that fashioned it: Why didst thou make me thus?" This is a free quotation of Is. xxix. 6, according to the LXX.

The creature in comparison with God, is like the vessel in the hand of the potter, and is bound to silent reverence in face of the policy of God. The quality of that which is fashioned depends on the plans of the artist.

21. From the same mass of plastic material (φύραμα—which elsewhere means paste, or dough of flour or meal) the potter fashions at pleasure vessels for honourable use (such as beautiful vases) and vessels for mean or lowly use (Cf. Wisd. xv. 7; 1 Tim. ii. 20 f.; Jer. xviii. 6).

Of course, the comparison of God with a potter must not be pressed, for the potter does not blame or punish the vessels which he makes for mean, or sordid, uses. The point of the parable is to exclude all arguing of men with God. It does not follow that God may not find fault with men, nor that He ever acts arbitrarily in guiding the fates of men. If the potter in his work follows the rules of art, it is no less true, as Chrysostom says, that "God never acts without reason, or by chance, even in cases where thou canst not penetrate to the secrets of His wisdom." The Omnipotent Artist is Wisdom itself!

- 22-23. In vv. 19-21 Paul has dealt with an objection which he sets aside as insolent and futile. With εἰ δὲ θέλων he takes

¹ Aquinas. Summa. Theol. i. 2; Q. 79, a. 3, should be compared: *Dicendum quod obcæcatio et obduratio duo important; quorum unum est motus animi humani in-hærentis malo et aversi a divino lumine, et quantum ad hoc, Deus non est causa excæcationis, sicut non est causa peccati. Aliud autem est subtractio gratiæ, ex qua sequitur, quod mens divinitus non illuminetur ad recte videndum et cor hominis non emolliatur ad recte vivendum, et quantum ad hoc Deus est causa excæcationis et obdu-rationis.*

² The reading *queritur* is not correct.

up vv. 15-18 again. He is thinking of the Jews who reject the Gospel, and who are hardened after the fashion of Pharaoh.

The anacoluthon in vv. 22-23 can easily be remedied by supplying some such question as: "How is God unjust in this?" Θέλων can be taken in the sense, "because He wished." God has been tolerant with the Jews, (a) to give them time and opportunity for repentance; (b) to manifest in them His wrath and power, and thus to emphasise, by contrast, His¹ goodness towards the elect.

The Jews who refused to accept Christ were "vessels of wrath" (though not necessarily "vessels of hate"), for God's anger is against all injustice and iniquity (i. 18).

The "vessels of wrath" are described as κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν. The Vulgate has rendered this, *apta in interitum*. It is possible, as far as the form goes, to take κατηρτισμένα as meaning "prepared," or "who have prepared themselves," or "fully disposed." Probably it is best to understand it in this last sense, for Paul does not say how they have been prepared or fitted, or made fully ripe, for doom.² The difference in construction between ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν, and κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν seems to suggest that Paul wishes to speak definitely of a preparation to glory made by God, while leaving obscure the factors of the ripeness for destruction.

The nature of the "destruction" is disputed. It need not be understood necessarily as eternal punishment, for the immediate theme of discussion is the incredulous Jews, and Paul can hardly wish to say that the unbelieving Jews of his time are about to be cast into eternal "destruction." The "destruction" may be the various woes and miseries, political and moral, which would come upon the Jewish nation. They had become ready for these by their sins, and, above all, by their rejection of Christ. If this view of ἀπώλεια is correct, there is no question in this context of predetermination to eternal reprobation. His judgment on the unbelieving Jewish nation will display the might of God, and the fury of His just wrath (i.e., His vindictive justice).

On the other hand, the wealth of God's goodness will be all the more striking by contrast. That goodness will be

¹ Cf. Wisdom xii. 20. The phrases, ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ, and κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν seem to be reminiscences from Wisdom xii.

² WW. have the reading *aptata*. Charue (*Incrédulité*, p. 290, note), thinks that κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν is like ὀφειλομένους θανάτῳ of Wisdom xii. 20, and means simply, fully ready for destruction, without any reference to a *determination antérieure vouant à la destruction*.

shown towards the "vessels of mercy"—*i.e.*, those who have accepted the call to the faith. The "glory," as distinct from "destruction," is grace which leads on to eternal glory. For this, God has definitely prepared the elect—*i.e.*, those whom He has called to the faith—whether from Judaism or heathenism. Even though "glory" includes the thought of eternal life, it does not follow that "destruction" means "eternal death."

As the whole section 14-23 is primarily concerned with the failure of the Jews to accept the Gospel, it seems most reasonable to limit the predestination here considered to predestination to faith and grace.

There is no compelling reason for deriving a special theological theory on the relations between grace and free will from the present context. Paul insists in general both on man's dependence on the divine call to faith, and grace, and glory, and on the possibility of his co-operation or non-co-operation with divine grace: Paul's treatment seems to leave the details of man's co-operation with grace to the speculative theologian.

(4) *The "Elect" are both from Heathenism and Israel.*

IX, 24-29

24. At the close of the preceding section (14-23) Paul spoke of those who have been called as being from among both Jews and Gentiles. He now goes on to show that the calling of the Gentiles and the rejection of the Jews are clearly taught in the Old Testament. The οὗς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς are the same as the σκεύη ἐλέους of *v.* 23. The anacoluthon after 24 may be removed by inserting, as already suggested, "How is God unjust in this?"

25-26. In the texts of Osee, quoted (i. 6, 8, 9; ii. 3, 25), οὐ λαόν μου and οὐκ ἠγαπημένην designated a Son (*Lo'-'ammi*) and a daughter (*Lo'-ruhamah*) respectively, of Osee. The symbolic names indicate the fate of Israel. The Chosen People, the recipients of God's mercies, will cease to belong to God; but that will be changed in the Messianic period, for then *Lo'-'ammi* ("Not-my-people") will become¹ *'Ammi* ("my people"), and *Lo'-ruhamah* ("Non-beloved," "Non-pitied") will become *Ruhamah* ("Beloved," "Pitied"). Osee speaks

¹ WW. remove the repetition in the ordinary Vulgate text by reading here, *Vocabo non plebem meam, plebem meam; et non misericordiam consecutam, misericordiam consecutam*. In Os. ii. 23, LXX has ἐγαπήσω τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην; in Os. i. 6 it has οὐκ ἠλεημένην. The numbering of the verses is not quite the same here in LXX and in Hebrew.

only of Jews, who fall away and return, but Paul takes the disloyal Jews who return as symbols of the heathens called to the faith (just as Peter does, 1 Pet. ii. 10). The prophecy of Osee is taken then as applying to the new Israel, the "Israel of God," which includes the believing heathens; and wherever there were heathens (*i.e.*, everywhere) they shall now be called "sons of the living God." God is called here the *living* God because there is question of bringing those who were dead in heathenism to the life of faith and grace.

27. The Isaian texts are quoted according to the LXX.

Isaias, God's herald, cries out concerning Israel (x. 22, 23): "Even if the number of the Israelites be as the sand of the sea, (only) a remnant will be saved." This text makes clear the rejection of the Jews as a people. Only a remnant was to be loyal to God.

28. Here the corresponding Hebrew text seems to mean: "Destruction is decreed; justice flows in; for destruction and decision the Lord will accomplish in the midst of the whole earth." In the LXX συντελῶν and συντέμνων correspond to "destruction" and "decision," and λόγον has taken the place of *killayon* (= destruction): συντέμνειν seems to mean here "to make short work with," and the general sense of the Greek text is, that God will quickly carry through His reckoning (λόγος) with the disloyal Jews. The reckoning will be speedy, thorough, and just. The "reckoning" was for Isaias immediately the horrors of Assyrian invasion. Paul sees a deeper reference in the prophet's words, to the obdurate unbelief of the Jewish nation in the New Testament period.

29. The text in v. 29 is from Is. i. 9—exactly according to the LXX.

Lord of Hosts is a frequent title of God in the Old Testament: it means "Lord of the battle-hosts" of heaven. The σπέρμα is regarded by Paul as identical with the "Remnant" of v. 27, and in fact the Hebrew text of Is. i. 9 has: "If the Lord of Hosts had not left us a little *remnant*, or a surviving element (*saridh*), etc.¹ Corresponding to ὑπόλειμμα in Is. x. 22 we have in Hebrew *sh'ar*—which is the technical term used in the so-called "Remnant-Section" in Isaias. The rendering of *saridh* (= remnant) by σπέρμα (seed) is not greatly misleading: the seed kept for planting is itself a sort of "remnant" or survival. Again, in this

¹ Is. vi. 13 speaks of the Remnant as a "holy seed"—but the clause in which this designation occurs is absent from the LXX.

text, the emphasis is on the small number of the Israelites who would receive the blessings of the Messianic period—that is, for Paul—on the small number of Jews who would accept Christ.

(b) THE GUILT OF UNBELIEVING ISRAEL. IX, 30-X, 21

(1) *The Jews have stumbled over the "stone of stumbling."*
IX, 30-33

30. What then is the outcome of the discussion ?

In the first place, the Gentiles have been called to the Faith, and through the Faith have attained to justice—even though they had not striven after justice. The ἔθνη (Gentiles generally) made no profession, as the Jews did,¹ of pursuing justice, and yet they have attained it.

31. In the second place, Israel, though it strove after the "Law of Justice" ² (i.e., the Mosaic Law—which they regarded as a means of obtaining justice), did not succeed in fulfilling that Law (εἰς νόμον οὐκ ἔφθασεν (cf. Matth. xii. 28) ; they did not succeed, that is, in attaining justice through the Law.

32. Israel failed because it followed a false path. The Gentiles attained to justification through faith, which is granted graciously by God (iv. 5). But Israel foolishly thought it could secure justice, by works, by its own effort—as a sort of wage for work done. The ambition of the Jews was to fulfil the commands of the Mosaic Law, and so, as they foolishly imagined, to attain to justice ; but they did not succeed in fulfilling the Law's command, so that, not only was their idea of attaining justice false, but the means by which they hoped to reach it proved unsuitable.

Justice could not be secured as a wage for work done, and the work in question (the fulfilment of the Mosaic Law) was neither carried out, nor feasible.

The terms δῶκοντα and κατέλαβεν may perhaps, like τρέχειν in v. 16, be derived from the racecourse (Cf. Phil. iii. 12, etc.).

In v. 31 the νόμος δικαιοσύνης takes the place of δικαιοσύνη ; it means Law, as promising justice, or as a way leading to justice, and in the context, it is, apparently, the Law of Moses regarded as a means of attaining justice. One does

¹ The point is not that the Gentiles did not seek justice ; but that their characteristic attitude was not, like that of the Jews, the seeking of justice.

² A "Law of Justice"—because promising justice to those who observed it ; and regarded, therefore, as a means to justice.

not "pursue" a thing that one actually possesses, and the Jews actually *had* the Law of Moses; but they did not possess it as a means of attaining to justice, and so might be said to "pursue" it as such a means.

Εἰς νόμον οὐκ ἔφθασεν—the Vulgate has *in legem justitiæ non pervenit*—which is based on a poorly supported text, though it gives the correct sense. Φθάνειν εἰς = καταλαμβάνειν.

33. They did not attain to justice—because they wished to be justified, not through faith, but—as they supposed (= ὥς)—through works. (And so) they stumbled over the [well-known] stone that makes men stumble. The "stone" is that spoken of by Isaias (viii. 14 and xxviii. 16). The "stone of stumbling" is the Messiah (Is. xxviii. 16). In Is. viii. 14 Yahweh is called a stone of stumbling and a rock of scandal with which Israel collides, and so is made to fall.¹ Both passages are fused here by Paul to explain the failure of unbelieving Israel. Christ did not correspond to the Jewish notion of the Messiah, and thus He became for them a stone of stumbling. Christ was to be for the fall and the uprising of many. (Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 6 ff; Matth. xxi. 42; Luke ii. 34).

(2) *Failure of the Jews to grasp the idea of the justice of faith.*
X, 1-13

In this section Paul explains in detail how the Jews have stumbled over the "stone of stumbling."

1. As at the beginning of chapter IX, he emphasises his deep sympathy for his people. His heart knows only one longing (εὐδοκία) and his prayers only one aim—the salvation of his brethren.
Chrysostom explains εὐδοκία as = "ardent longing." Erasmus suggests *propensa benevolentia* (Cf. Eph. i. 5: εὐδόκησις is the form commonly used). The μέν implies that his longing and his prayers have to face difficulties.
- 2-3. It is true that the Jews have zeal for God's honour: ² but they are lacking in insight. Lack of insight has been the ground of their failure to understand the nature of true justice; it caused them to follow a path which did not lead to justice, and to refuse obedience to God.
Failing to appreciate duly (ἀγνοοῦντες) the "justice of God" (= δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως, ix. 30—the justice which God gives to men on the basis of faith), they sought to set

¹ There is difference here between the Masoretic text and the LXX. The text of Paul, as a conflate, cannot be definitely attached to either.

² For Paul's "zeal" as a Jew, cf. Gal. i. 14: Acts xxi. 20; xxii. 3. Josephus discusses this quality of the Jews in *Contra Ap.* ii., 20.

up a justice of their own (δικαιοσύνη ἐξ ἑργων, ix. 32—the “justice” which they sought to attain by their own effort as a payment for work done).¹ In following this policy they refused to submit to the justice of God—i.e., they have refused to obey the command to believe, though faith is a necessary condition of attaining the “justice of God.”

4. Their refusal to believe is a great folly—a token of the utter lack of ἐπίγνωσις; for the purpose of the Law and of the entire Old Dispensation was to lead to faith in Christ, and thus to true justice. Christ is the τέλος of the Law. He is its goal, its terminus. In Gal. iii. 24 f. Paul shows how the Law’s function was to be men’s παιδαγωγός unto Christ. But in leading men to Christ the Law led them to God’s justice through faith in Christ, thus abrogating itself as a means to justice. In speaking of Christ as the τέλος of the Law Paul is not here thinking primarily of Christ as the “end” (abrogation) of the Law; yet, as the “goal” of the Law, Christ must be, in some effective sense, its “end” also, and that implication can scarcely be excluded from the present context.

5. The text in view here and in Gal. iii. 12 is Lev. xviii. 5, which, referring to the Commandments of God whose observance has just been inculcated, says, & ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. The best reading here in Paul is, according to Lagrange, that which deviates most from Lev. (and from Gal. iii. 12): γράφει ὅτι τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὁ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ. In this reading (v. Soden) τὴν δικαιοσύνην, which is governed by ποιήσας, is put at the beginning for emphasis: “Moses writes: He that does the justice which is of the Law will live therein.” The Vulgate bears out this reading (except that it has *scripsit*, instead of *scribit*).

Paul presupposes as familiar the context of Lev. xviii. 5. The life which is to be secured by fulfilment of the Law is life in friendship with God. If the Jew faithfully observed the Law, God would be gracious and friendly towards him. This living in friendly relationship with the Lord would continue as long as faithful observance of the divine commands continued. But Paul has already shown that, for various reasons, the observance of the divine positive Law was exceedingly difficult and, indeed, without special divine help, not feasible (Cf. ii. 13, 17-29; iii. 19). Now if we compare such proposed means of attaining justice as complete observance of the Law of Moses, and faith in Christ, we

¹ Cf. Phil. iii. 9.

cannot hesitate to accept the latter, for it is neither difficult nor out of our reach. Moreover, the "justice of the Law," apart from grace, that is, as distinct from the justice of faith, is a mere delusion (Cf. ii. 13; Gal. iii. 11).

- 6-8. The passage here quoted is Deut. xxx. 11-14: "For this commandment which I enjoin on thee to-day neither transcends thy strength, nor is out of thy reach. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldst say: 'Who will ascend for us to heaven to bring it down to us, and announce it to us, that we may observe it?' Nor is it beyond the Sea, that thou shouldst say: 'Who will cross the Sea for us, and bring it to us, and announce it to us, that we may observe it?' But very near is the Word to thee—[it is] in thy mouth and heart, that thou mayest observe it."

Paul takes this as an utterance of the personified Justice-through-faith. The Deuteronomic passage had spoken of the nearness of God's Word (Law): it is not necessary to climb the sky, or to cross the seas to find it: it is at hand for each one, since each one has it in his heart, and on his lips. This Paul applies to the justice of faith. It is not something that must be brought down from heaven, or brought up from the underworld; for Christ has already come down from heaven, and has risen from the dead. The actions that were needed to make the justice of faith accessible, have already been accomplished by Christ—through His Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection. To acquire the justice of faith we need only to accept all this by faith, and to make profession thereof with our lips. Thus it is as easy for us to acquire the justice of faith, as it was for the Jews to *know* the Law of Moses.

The message of the Christian faith which makes clear all the redemptive work of Christ is available for all in the Apostolic preaching, and indeed that message is contained, at least obscurely, in the Old Testament itself.

This seems to be the general sense of vv. 6-8. It is evident that Paul deals very freely with Deut. xxx. 11-14. He takes it, apparently, as applicable in substance to the justice which is through faith; but he quotes it in a piecemeal fashion, and he differs strikingly in his text of the passage, both from the Masoretes and the LXX. Note, for instance, how "across the seas" (LXX, πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης) becomes for Paul, εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον (*in abyssum*), and includes a reference to the death of Christ and His *descensus ad inferos* (1 Pet. iii. 19).¹ Again, in v. 8, Paul takes the word of the Law as

¹ Cf. Ps. lxxi. 20; cvii. 26.

"the word of Faith which we preach"—i.e., the Gospel-message. While, then, it is easy enough to see what Paul means in *vv.* 6-8, it is difficult to see whether he is eliciting an argument from the deeper, or typological, sense of the Deuteronomic passage, or merely using the language and imagery of an Old Testament text to convey his meaning—without implying that the Old Testament has any connection, either of literal or mystical sense, with the thought he wishes to express. Several modern Catholic commentators find here an instance of "accommodation." Other exegetes have endeavoured to show that Paul is actually expounding the deeper, or "mystical," sense of Deut. xxx. 11-14—showing, that is, that under the word of the Law, that passage really referred to the "justice of faith." In this reference Aquinas says: *Non est inconueniens, si quod Moyses dicit de mandato legis, hoc apostolus attribuit Christo: quia Christus est Verbum Dei in quo sunt omnia Dei mandata.*

Even, however, if we refuse to believe that Paul is here arguing from a mystical, or deeper, sense of Scripture, we can scarcely hold that he is using Scripture in a purely "accommodated" sense: There is for Paul something more at stake than the mere use of Scripture words and imagery: the very possibility of using the Deuteronomic text to convey his meaning is, in itself, an argument for the truth of his teaching.

In *v.* 8 the Vulgate wrongly adds *Scriptura (quid dicit Scriptura)*: it is still the "justice of faith" that is supposed to be speaking in Deut. xxx.

The "word of faith" = the word that is heralded forth by the apostolic preachers to produce faith—i.e., the Gospel message as preached.

- 9-11. These verses develop the thought of *vv.* 6-8, and show that men can be justified if they give credulous hearing to the Apostolic preaching. The putting of the oral confession before believing with the heart is due to the quotation in *v.* 8: "In thy mouth and in thy heart." In *v.* 18 believing is put before confessing. It is clear, of course, that both the inner conviction and the external profession are necessary. The former without the latter is a dead thing, and the latter without the former is mere hypocrisy. Profession in word includes every kind of external acknowledgment—by word, action, cult, etc. The main theme of profession is that Jesus is Lord (*Cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 3; Phil. ii. 11). The title "Lord" includes all that was preached and believed concerning Jesus—His divinity, Incarnation, work of Redemption, Resurrection, and glorification. It has been suggested that "Lord"

was specially applied to Jesus to convey to the pagan world that Jesus was everything that "Christ" or *Mashiah* (Messias) implied for the Jewish world. The implication of this theory is that the title "Christ" meant nothing more than a mere designation, or proper name, to the Greeks, and that "Lord" would be a practically unmeaning designation to the Semitic mind.

It is, however, certain that Jesus was called *Mari*, or *Marana* ("Lord," "Our Lord") in the primitive Aramaic-speaking church,¹ and that the title "Lord" was, therefore, not a borrowing from Hellenic usage.

The profession that Jesus is Lord rests on the inner conviction that He was raised from the dead by the Father. Through that profession and belief salvation is procured. The Resurrection is put forward here as the fundamental dogma of the faith; belief in the Resurrection practically included belief in all else that was preached about Christ.²

In verse 10 Paul indicates the two stages in the procuring of salvation: in the first, inner justice is effected by the internal act of faith; in the second, that condition of justice is stabilised and maintained by outward profession, as above explained; and the practical believer is thus saved from eternal death.

11. That faith in Jesus and its manifestation in conduct lead to salvation is proved from the Isaian text already quoted in ix. 33 (Is. xxviii. 16): "He that believes in the Stone set up in Sion (=the Messias), shall not be put to shame."
12. Paul reads πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων instead of the original Isaian text, ὁ πιστεύων (So Vulgate—*Omnis qui credit*: cf. ix. 33), and in v. 12 he uses the πᾶς to insist on the necessity of faith in Jesus for *all*. The way of salvation—faith in Jesus—is the same for all, whether Jews or Gentiles. There is no difference in regard to the need of faith in Jesus between Jews and Gentiles: all have the same Lord—*i.e.*, Jesus Christ (cf. Acts x. 36)—and He graciously dispenses His treasures to all that call upon His name (Cf. Acts ix. 14-21 and Eph. iii. 8). To call upon the name of Christ was to act towards Christ as the Jews used to act towards God (cf. 1 Cor. i. 2—Christians are those who call upon the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ): it was a public profession of His divinity, and a public acknowledgment of His right to the worship of His followers.
13. Since, then, Christ is the object of our worship, Paul applies to the worship of Christ what Joel (iii. 5) had said

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 22; i. 13; viii. 5-6; Apoc. xxii. 20.

² WW. read *excitavit* instead of *suscitavit*.

of the worship of Yahweh. The divine name Yahweh is represented by Κύριος without the article—which thus becomes a sort of personal name of Christ. In thus identifying Christ with the Yahweh of Joel's text Paul reminds the Jews that he is not preaching an absolutely new religion. Belief in Jesus ought not to be difficult for a Jew, and this makes Jewish incredulity all the more unpardonable.

(3) *The Jews have refused to hear the message of faith.*

X, 14-17

In verse 13 Paul has proved from Joel that salvation is possible only through invoking the name of the Lord. He now goes on to discuss the conditions which are required, if the Jews are to invoke the name of Christ. It is because verses 12 and 13 emphasise the invocation of the Lord, rather than belief in Him, that Paul speaks here rather about invoking than believing.

14. One can only invoke One in whom one believes, and one can only believe a person whom one has heard¹—for faith (in the present case) comes from hearing, not from studious reading. Following the example of their Master the Apostles announced their message *orally* to the world. They communicated by writing, for the most part, only with such communities and individuals as had already heard the Truth preached. Writing presupposed oral teaching, and followed it: instruction in writing was primarily intended to recall, or corroborate, or expound the "Word of faith."
15. Obviously, then, the Word that gives rise to faith can only be heard when it is preached. And only he can preach who has received a mission to preach.

The passage from Isaiah (lii. 7) represents the men of Sion rejoicing over the "feet" (*i.e.*, the coming) of those who brought good tidings. Paul regards the text, which literally refers to the announcement of the close of the Exile and the return of the Exiles from Babylon, as referring, in its deeper or mystical meaning, to the announcement of the Gospel (—which was also a message of liberation)—by the authentic preachers.

In his quotation of Is. lii. 7 Paul differs from the LXX text, which has:

ὡς ὥρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὁρέων ὡς πόδες
εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης
ὡς εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀγαθά.

¹ Gutjahr takes οὐ in οὐ οὐκ ἤκουσαν as referring to Jesus—not as preaching, but as the theme of preaching: "How shall they believe in Him whose word they have not heard preached (or 'about Whom they have heard nothing?')". So Lietzmann.

He keeps, however, close to the Hebrew text, but quotes only so much of it as he requires for his purpose.¹

For Paul the feet of the Apostles² are "beautiful" because they bear the Apostles swiftly on to proclaim to all the end of the captivity of Sin, and to publish to all the peace which Christ has established by His death (Eph. vi. 15; ii. 17; Col. i. 20), and to proclaim the blessings (the "good things") which Christ has merited for men.

It is important to note how clearly all that Paul here says emphasises the principle that only those are entitled to announce the Gospel who have received an authentic mission. Those who are specially called "Apostles" (= the "Sent") had certainly received such authentic mission from Christ (cf. xv. 18; 1 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 19 f.; xiii. 3): through the Apostles Christ speaks, and, since the Apostles could not carry on their mission personally for ever, Christ speaks also through the successors of the Apostles, the Bishops.

16. All the conditions necessary that the Jews might hear the authentic Word have been fully realised. Yet "not all" (a litotes) have accepted the Gospel. With ὑπήκουσαν cf. ὑπετάγησαν in v. 3, above.

This disobedience of the Jews is not, however, surprising: it was foretold by Isaias (liii. 1)—for the words of Isaias refer to the "Servant of Yahweh," and, therefore, to Jesus of Nazareth. John (xii. 37 f) makes a similar use of the Isaian passage. The complaint of the Prophet about the unbelief concerning the "Servant" was, at the same time, a prophecy of Jewish incredulity towards Christ.

In the original text ἡ ἀκοή ἡμῶν = "the message we have heard" (*sh'mu'athenu*), not "the message we have preached." Objectively, however, as Zahn notes, both meanings of the phrase coincide: what is κήρυγμα from the preacher's standpoint is ἀκοή from that of his audience, and, moreover, the Prophet preaches only what he has heard.

For faith, then, in addition to hearing the Truth, willingness to accept it (ὑπακοή) on the part of the hearers is necessary. But this willingness is as lacking in the Jewish contemporaries of Paul as it was in the Jews of Isaias' day. The Jews will not listen to the Gospel of Christ.

17. Paul infers from the Isaian text that faith normally arises through hearing and accepting the preaching of the official

¹ The Vulgate adds here *evangelizantium pacem*: cf. DG and Peshitta. This appears to be a Western interpolation due to the influence of the LXX.

² Note how Paul replaces the singular—the εὐαγγελιζόμενος (*mēbasser*)—by the plural: in the "messenger" that brings good tidings he sees the preachers of the Christian Faith.

heralds of Christ. The Apostolic preaching itself (ἡ ἀκοή) is through Christ's "Word." As in the days of Isaias Israel received God's message from the lips of the prophet, who himself had received it immediately from the Lord; so now in the Christian period, Israel receives God's revelation from the lips of the Apostles, who themselves received it from the lips of Christ, Who Himself received it from God. Thus it can be said that the preaching of the Apostles is "through the Word of Christ"—that is, through the actual message of Salvation which the Apostles had heard from Christ's own lips: that message of Salvation is the message which the Apostles proclaim as a divine revelation to the world. In another sense, too, the Apostolic preaching is "through the word of Christ"—for the Apostles received their formal mission to preach through a direct command (a "Word") of Christ.

In v. 17 we have, then, a repetition of the sequence discussed in vv. 14-15, Faith—Preaching—Mission: the preachers have been sent; they have published the message entrusted to them; if the Jews accept that message salvation will come to them also!

(4) *The incredulity of the Jews is inexcusable.* X, 18-21

18. If the Jews had not heard about Christ they could not be expected to believe in Him. Can it be objected that they have not heard about Him? Paul answers *μενοῦνγε*—nay—but (= *immo vero*) "their voice has gone out to all the earth, and their words to the ends of the world."

The Psalm passage (Ps. xviii. 5) speaks directly of the glory of God as heralded forth by the heavens, and it is not necessary to suppose that Paul gives the "mystical" sense of that passage as proving his contention. The Psalmist's words are suitable to express the enormously swift and huge expansion of Apostolic preaching. There is, of course, a certain hyperbole involved in taking the Psalm text verbally as descriptive of Apostolic achievement. Yet the Faith was, in fact, already so widely known that Paul could reasonably give this answer to the objection that possibly the Jews had not heard the message of Christ.

μενοῦνγε = *immo vero*; Yes, indeed! cf. ix. 20; Phil. iii. 8.

19. Paul puts himself another objection. The Jews had seen that the Apostolic message had been delivered to the Gentiles, and so they might object that a Gospel apparently intended for Gentiles could not be the genuine message of the Messias.

The objection could be easily answered by reference to early Jewish grumbling against the Gentile mission (Acts xiii. 45 ; xviii. 12 ; xxiv. 5 ; 1 Thess. ii. 16). The Gospel had been first preached to the Jews ; and if they had not regarded it as a message meant for them, they would not have raised objections against Apostolic preaching to the Gentiles. Paul, however, instead of developing this argument, reminds the Jews that they have no right to assume the attitude implied by the objection, since it is evident from the Law and the Prophets that the message of Messianic Salvation must be delivered also to the Gentiles. This is clear from Deut. xxxii. 21 : " I will make them jealous by a 'non-people' : by a foolish people I will make them angry." ¹ Paul substitutes "you" for the "them" of the Masorettes and LXX.

The "non-people" must be a people that is not God's people—i.e., a heathen people, and the "foolish (=godless) nation" is, in the parallelism identical with the "non-people." God will show such preference for a Gentile people that His own people will be jealous and angry.

The Vulgate, *in iram vos mittam*, means *in iram vos inducam*.

20. Again, in Isaias lxv. 1, God's benignity towards the Gentiles is clearly asserted. Paul describes Isaias as acting daringly (i.e., without regard to the hostility his words would excite among the people) in saying (i.e., in representing God as saying) :

"I was to be found (I let myself be found) by those that sought me not ; I became visible to those who asked naught of me."

The people that do not seek the Lord, and that "ask no oracle" of Him (ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν) are the Gentiles, as Paul understands the text. It will be noted that Paul follows the LXX in inverting the order of the verse as it appears in the Masoretic text.

21. As in the text quoted (lxv. 1), Isaias represents God as making Himself accessible to the Gentiles, so in the next following verse (Is. lxvi. 2) the disloyalty of Israel to God is vividly expressed in the complaint of Yahweh :

"I spread out my hands all the day
To an unruly and rebellious people."

¹ LXX and Paul read—"against a non-people," "against a foolish people." In calling Moses πρῶτος Paul wishes to make it clear that even the great Law-maker of Israel himself had to reproach the Jews of his time for their tendency to false-worship. Israel still shows the same unwillingness to give to God the ὑπακοή πίστεως which it displayed in the days of Moses.

These words, in distinction from the preceding (lxv. 1), Paul regards as directed to Israel.

Israel's attitude towards God has, then, been constantly one of disobedience and opposition. It is, therefore, not surprising that the Jews of the present, are hostile and incredulous towards Christ, and contemptuous of His gracious and inviting love.

(c) ISRAEL HAS NOT BEEN COMPLETELY REJECTED. XI, 1–36

(1) *God has chosen a Remnant of the Jews.* XI, 1–6

1. It might seem as if the incredulity of the Jewish nation would involve the penalty of divine rejection for all Jews. Yet that is not so—as can be seen in the case of Paul himself.¹ Paul a genuine “Israelite” (cf. ix. 4), a son of Abraham, and a member of the tribe of Benjamin, has been called to the Faith and made an Apostle—a herald of the Gospel to the nations. Thus it is clear that God “has not rejected His people,² whom He foreknew” (Cf. viii. 9). God “foresaw” that His people would largely reject His Messias. Yet, in spite of this, He chose Israel as His own people. He cannot, then, have intended to reject them all.
- 2–3. It is now as in the days of Elias. Paul appeals to his readers' knowledge of the Old Testament. “In Elias” means “In the section dealing with Elias.”³ ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ: This clause depends on οὐκ οἴδατε: ἐντυγχάνω τινὶ κατὰ τινος is to deal with someone against a person, to complain to someone against a third. Elias' complaint against Israel is in 3 Kings xix. 10; it was uttered when Elias was flying from the persecution of Achab and Jezabel. The text is not reproduced word for word: Paul gives its general sense.
4. The answer of God is here called χρηματισμός (= oracular utterance); it declares that Elias is not alone: there are seven thousand other men who have not worshipped Baal. Καταλείπειν = left over, reserved: the corresponding word in the original, *hish'arti*, means “I will make to survive,” or “I have made to survive.”⁴ Paul adds ἐμμενῶ. The peculiar construction τῇ βᾶαλ is probably due to the custom

¹ The sense is not merely that a single contradictory instance refutes a universal statement, but that Paul's case is to be taken as a sort of guarantee that God's grace and mercy are still available for His people.

² For the phrase, “Reject His people”—see 1 Sam. xii. 22; Ps. xciii. 14.

³ This manner of quoting is common in Philo, and in the Rabbinical writings. Cf. Mark xii. 26; Luke xx. 37.

⁴ Cf. the κατάλειμμα (*she'ar* or *she'erith*) of Isaiah. Is. x. 22, etc.

of substituting αἰσχύνη (= "shame" : Hebrew, *bosheth*—as in the names 'Ish-bosheth, for 'Ish-Baal, etc., etc.) for Baal wherever it occurred in the Hebrew text : ¹ thus would arise such expressions as ἡ βάαλ, αἱ βάαλ (Cf. Os.ii. 8; 1 Sam. vii. 4.)

5. The seven thousand who have not bent the knee to Baal have been reserved that they may perpetuate the people of God. So now, in Paul's day, a "remnant" has been saved from the general destruction, as a guarantee of the persistence and ultimate victory of loyal Judaism.² The "remnant" of believing Jews has been determined by the gracious choice of God. The divine grace has made a selection among the children of Abraham (ix. 6-13).

6. If then it is grace that has made the selection, that selection cannot have been due to any achievements of the elect : it was a free gift (χάρις), excluding merit.³ Free gift and merit, or wage, are mutually exclusive.⁴ *Nisi gratis est, gratia non est. Ideo gratia vocatur quia gratis datur* (Aug., *De gratia et libero arbitrio* : 21, 43).

(2) *The other Jews have been "hardened."* XI, 7-10

7. Though Israel has striven after justice (ix. 31), only a specially chosen section of Israel (ἡ ἐκλογὴ) has attained it—through faith, however, not through works (ix. 30). The rest of the nation is obdurate : as the Vulgate renders it, *ceteri excæcati sunt*. The meaning of ἐπωρώθησαν has been variously explained. Robinson (*Journal of Theological Studies*, 1902, 81-83) proposes to render πωροῦν : "to blind," "to make blind." Zahn prefers the meaning "harden." In Hesychius and Suidas πωροῦσθαι is equated with τυφλοῦσθαι. In John xii. 40 πωροῦν is rendered by the Vulgate with *indurare*, and in 2 Cor. iii. 14 ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα appears in the Vulgate as *obtusi sunt sensus*. In other cases (cf. Mark iii. 5; vi. 52; Eph. iv. 18) the Vulgate associates with πώρωσις the notion of "blindness." The word is derived from πῶρος, which means a kind of marble, and, by extension—a callus, or ossification. Thus πωρόω would naturally mean "I petrify," or "I cover with a callus" (and thus, metaphorically, I make dead, or insensitive, or obtuse). It is used in the present context, perhaps, as a somewhat stronger expression than σκληρύνειν (ix. 18), and we can regard it as meaning here

¹ Cf. 1 Kings xviii. 19, 25.

² WW. read here, *reliquiæ secundum electionem gratiæ factæ sunt*—omitting *salvæ*.

³ Ἐπεὶ here means "otherwise," as below in v. 22.

⁴ The Textus Receptus adds to v. 6 εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων, οὐκέτι ἐστὶ χάρις ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐκέτι ἐστὶν ἔργον. This is a gloss.

to reduce to spiritual insensibility, to make spiritually blind. In Eph. iv. 19, those affected by πώρωσις are ἀπηλγηκότες—devoid of sensibility—the natural effect of a callosity.

8. To prove that Israel has been blinded or rendered callous, Paul refers to two similar Old Testament texts (Is. xxix. 10 and Deut. xxix. 3), which he fuses in his quotation. According to Is. xxix. 10, God has poured out on Israel a spirit of *tardemah* (LXX renders κατάνυξις = stupefaction: Jerome renders *sopor*: here the Vulgate gives the Old Latin rendering of κατάνυξις—*compunctio*). God has permitted Israel to lapse into a condition of somnolency or stupor, so that they neither see with their eyes nor hear with their ears (according to Deut. xxix. 3, and, possibly, Is. vi. 9). What happened in the days of Isaias and Moses has happened again in Paul's time, Israel has lapsed again into a state of moral torpor or insensibility.

- 9-10. The present rejection of Israel Paul finds also adumbrated in verses 23-24 of the imprecatory Psalm lxviii—a Psalm which is often used as Messianic in the New Testament (Cf. xv. 3). The Psalmist prays that ruin may come on his enemies while they feast, and that their banquet-table may bring them destruction, and that God's anger may smite them with blindness and deformity of body. Paul has changed the LXX form of the Psalm verses, which is reproduced in the familiar Vulgate:

Fiat mensa eorum coram ipsis in laqueum et in retributiones et in scandalum.

"Before them" is omitted: εἰς θήραν (*in captionem*) is added; ¹ ἀνταπόδομα has taken the place of ἀνταπόδοσις, and has been shifted to the end of the clause. In the present condition of unbelieving Israel Paul sees the imprecation of David fulfilled. The Jews stubbornly adhere to their "table"—i.e., they limit themselves absolutely to the Old Testament; and the food which they find there has become for them poisonous and destructive. They are spiritually blind, and their backs are bent with a permanent deformity.

(3) *The rejection of Israel helps to hasten the Conversion of the Gentiles.* XI, 11-15

11. The failure of Israel to believe, its stumbling over the "Stone of Stumbling" (ix. 32 f.) is but a means to an end. Israel has stumbled over the Messiah, but not so as never to

¹ Παγίς, θήρα and σκάνδαλον are almost synonymous here. The three words are used to show that no kind of snare will be lacking.

right itself again, and the stumbling of Israel has brought the Gospel all the more quickly to the heathen. The ἵνα in ἵνα πείσωσιν refers to the divine purpose, and the question asks whether the fall of Israel over the stone of stumbling was something intended by God for its own sake, and not as leading on to something further.

The immediate outcome of the present Jewish debacle is the coming of salvation to the Gentiles. The salvation of the Gentiles will, in its turn, stimulate the Jews to emulate the faith of the Gentiles.

The sense is not, of course, that the Gentiles would not have attained to salvation unless the Jews had failed: the promises of Salvation to the Gentiles were not made dependent on any such condition (iv. 9 ff.). But through the failure of the Jews to believe, the Gentiles have heard the Word of faith all the sooner. It was Jewish incredulity and hostility that drove the Apostolic preachers to the Gentiles (Cf. Acts xiii. 46; xiv. 1; xvii. 1 f.; xviii. 4 ff.; xix. 9; xxviii. 28; Rom. i. 10; Matth. x. 6, 23; xv. 24; xxi. 43; xxii. 9, etc., etc.). Thus, as Christ had foretold, the last have become first, and the first last.

But when the Jews thus become the last, they will be roused to emulation of the heathens, as Paul infers from the text quoted in x. 19 (Deut. xxxii. 21). Paul sees prophetically this emulation as an accomplished fact, and cries out in jubilation:

12. "If the fall of the Jews was a source of salvation to the Gentiles, how much more shall not their rehabilitation (*i.e.*, their entry as a people into the Messianic Kingdom) bring blessing to the whole world?" As Augustine says: *Bonum est potentius ad utilitatem inferendam quam malum: sed malum Judæorum magnam utilitatem gentibus contulit; ergo multo majorem confert mundo eorum bonum.*

The "wealth of the world" = the spiritual wealth of the heathen world. The ἥττημα of Israel is its "loss" (ἥττημα = the classical ἥττα)—*i.e.*, the failure of all but a Remnant to believe: the opposite to that ἥττημα of Israel is its πλήρωμα —*i.e.*, its "gain," its acceptance of the Faith as a whole people (Cf. vv. 15 and 25). The sense of verse 12 is not: "If the conversion of the Jews in such small numbers has brought so much profit to the world, what would not their full conversion do?"

13. Paul here speaks especially to the Gentile members of the Roman Church, to express the intensity of his own desire for the conversion of the Jews. Ἐφ' ὅσον does not mean, "so long as," but "so far as," that is, "just because":

the ἐγώ is emphatic, marking Paul off from the other Apostles as in a special way the Apostle of the Gentiles.

14-15. His office of Apostle to the Gentiles (διακονία) Paul "glorifies" (*i.e.*, brings honour to it) by devoting himself unreservedly to his task. Yet, at the same time, he has in view the conversion of his "flesh"—*i.e.*, of his relatives according to the flesh (ix. 3), his fellow Jews. If the "rejection" of those relatives (*i.e.*, their exclusion from the Messianic Kingdom) has led to the reconciliation of the world (*i.e.*, of the Gentiles) with God, the "acceptance" of the Jews into the Messianic Kingdom will be a ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν.

There is much dispute as to the meaning of ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν. The more widely accepted view is that it is the life that is given to those who are raised up from the dead—and that Paul means that the full return of the Jews will be immediately followed by the General Resurrection, the completion of the whole work of Redemption. Some exegetes take it as a more or less universal resurrection from the death of Sin, a tremendous growth of Christian faith and life throughout the world—such that men will become generally ὡσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντες (vi. 13). It is argued against this second interpretation that there would be little or no time for such a great religious revival to show itself in action after the πλήρωμα of the Jews has been accepted into the Church. Is it to be put during the rule of the Man of Sin (2 Thess. ii. 3, 9 ff), or is it to take place just before the Second Coming?

Against the first view it is objected that if Paul meant by ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν the General Resurrection, he would not have expressed himself so obscurely. He could just as easily have said ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν! Besides, he has been speaking of the effect on the world of the Jewish ἥττημα, and we naturally expect that he would wish to hint at the much greater effect on the world of the Jewish πλήρωμα.

It is difficult to be confident about the precise sense of "Life from the dead," but verse 26 and the context generally, which implies that the ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν is something immensely greater than καταλλαγή κόσμου, seem to favour the first interpretation. SH quote Origen as a definite supporter of the first view: *Tunc enim erit assumptio Israel, quando et mortui vitam recipient et mundus ex corruptibili incorruptibilis fiet, et mortales immortalitate donabuntur.*¹

The more thoroughly and vigorously, then, Paul exercises

¹ It is possible that in using the phrase ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν Paul has in view such Scripture passages as Is. xxvi. 19 and Ezech. xxxvii. In the Book of Henoch, li. i, the Resurrection is regarded as the first stage in the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom.

his Apostolic ministry among the Gentiles, the more speedily will come reconciliation of his own people with God ; and with the full reconciliation of the Jews with God will be ushered in the period in which will be shown forth the full glory of the children of God. Thus the Jews should not be exasperated by Paul's interest in the Gentiles, nor the Gentiles offended by his obvious concern for the Jews.

(4) *Judaism the olive stem on which converts from heathenism have been engrafted as shoots of wild olive.* XI, 16-24

16. The reception of Israel into the Messianic Kingdom (ἡ πρόσλημψις) may be confidently expected, because Israel is fundamentally a holy people.

The Jews are the dough-mass (τὸ φύρμα) of which the first-fruits (ἡ ἀπαρχή) are the Patriarchs. But the first fruits of a mass (φύρμα) when offered to God sanctify the whole mass (*Cf.* Num. xv. 18 ff.). In the Patriarchs, then, Israel has received the seal of holiness and of consecration to God.

Again, the Jews are the branches of the tree sprung from the holy root of the Patriarchs, and must share in the holiness of that root.¹ They form with the Patriarchs an organic unity, and have, thereby, some sort of objective holiness or consecration (like the children of Christian parents, 1 Cor. vii. 14), and some kind of claim to share in the promises made to the Patriarchs and their seed.

This objective holiness of Israel and the rights to a share in Messianic blessings, which it implies, are not to be regarded as supporting Jewish self-complacency in fleshly descent from Abraham. Paul's point is that a people with such glorious antecedents must ultimately come to the true way of salvation—faith in Jesus Christ.

17. Continuing his imagery of the branches and the root, Paul takes occasion to warn his Gentile readers against all pride and self-exaltation.

He has spoken of the root and the branches ; now we hear that the tree is an olive tree. The olive tree represents the people of God : it was planted by God, and its branches bear fruit (*Cf.* Jer. xi. 16). The Gentiles are shoots of wild olive which have been engrafted on God's olive tree, and the rejected Jews are lopped off branches of that same tree. The engrafted wild-olive shoots get their sap of life and their vigour through union with the noble olive tree and

¹ In the Apocrypha Israel is called the " Plant of Justice " of which Abraham is the " root." *Cf.* Henoch. x. 16 ; xc. 2, 5, 8, 10. See SB. iii., p. 290.

its holy root. Paul is not thinking here of the custom of engrafting wild-olive shoots on olive trees to increase the fruitfulness of the latter ; he has in mind the flowing of sap and life from the fruitful olive into the engrafted shoots of wild olive (*Cf.* iv. 12 ; Gal. iii. 7). Men do not normally graft wild shoots on fruitful trees, but rather shoots of the fruitful tree on the wild tree, and Paul must have known this. His thought is perfectly clear, however, even if the imagery is not based on strict botanical principles.

Ἀγριέλαιος may be a substantive or adjective : it is usually taken as a noun—"wild-olive" (*Vulgate, oleaster*), or rather "wild-olive shoot." Ἐν αὐτοῖς = *among* the branches, not *instead of them*—as συνκοινωνός indicates.

The "root of fatness" (= the fat root) symbolises the promised blessings in which all God's people are to share. The Gentiles (the wild-olive shoots) are not to boast either against the lopped off branches or against the other branches (*Cf.* Eph. ii. 19). The engrafting of the wild shoots is due to their faith, not to their works, and, as has been shown, faith does not justify self-exaltation (iv. 5, 16).

18. Gentile Christians when tempted to boast against the Jews should remember that it is not through the Gentile Christians that the root of God's olive tree is alive and vigorous ; they themselves are sustained by the holy root, and by the fruitful tree, on which they have been engrafted. Christianity has its roots in Judaism : the promises which were made to Judaism are fulfilled in Christianity. Religious Anti-Semitism is therefore quite out of place among Christians. Compare with Paul's insistence here on the vital connection of Christianity with Judaism his teaching in Gal. iii ; vi. 16 ; Eph. i. 1-11 ; 2 Tim. i. 3, etc.
19. To justify his self-exaltation and arrogance the Gentile Christian may remind Paul that branches have been lopped off the olive that he might be engrafted : hence his boasting against the *rejected* Jews (not against Christian Jews) is reasonable. God Himself has rejected the unbelieving Jews, and He has engrafted the heathens on His olive-tree. Why should not the Gentiles rejoice over, and boast of, this divine policy ? Does it not prove that the heathens are of more value in God's eyes than the Jews ?
20. Paul answers : Yes, indeed, the branches have been lopped off to make way for you, but that gives you no ground for boasting. The Jews have been rejected, not because they were Jews, but because they refused to believe in Jesus Christ ; and the Gentiles have been engrafted on God's olive-tree because they have accepted Christ. For want of faith

(ἀπιστία) the Jews were lopped off: through faith the Gentile Christian stands firm. Since faith may be lost the engrafted wild shoots have no permanent guarantee of security. Instead, therefore, of indulging in proud thoughts (ὕψηλὰ φρονεῖν)¹ the converted heathen ought to fear (Cf. Phil. ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 3).

The Vulgate *propter incredulitatem* suggests that the lopping off of the branches was a punishment of unbelief. Paul says that it was *through* unbelief that the lopping off was brought about: the ablative *incredulitate* would represent the real meaning.

21. It is possible for converted heathens also to lose the faith,² and God will surely be no more gentle to apostate Gentile Christians than He has been to unbelieving Jews—(the natural branches of the olive-tree). Κατὰ φύσιν is in opposition to παρὰ φύσιν of v. 24.

Instead of οὐδέ (supported by B & A Coptic, Aug., etc.) the reading μήπως οὐδέ (Vulgate, *ne forte nec*, Chrysostom, etc.) has been accepted by some recent critics. If μήπως οὐδέ is adopted, it must be regarded as depending on a φοβοῦ taken over from v. 20. The reading οὐδέ ought, however, to be maintained: there is no suggestion here that disloyal Gentile Christians would be punished still more severely than unbelieving Jews.

22. The Gentiles are asked to note how God manifests His severity towards the incredulous Jews, and His immense generosity towards the Gentiles that believe. It is the obvious duty of the Gentiles by loyalty in faith to continue to abide within the sphere of that divine generosity. The generosity of God continues as long as the Gentile Christian holds fast to it, and submits himself completely to its control. To abide by God's goodness, according to Chrysostom, is to act worthily of God's goodness—for faith by itself is not sufficient. The Vulgate reads *severitatem* and *bonitatem*: but the correct Greek reading has the nominatives. Probably ἀποτομία and χρηστότης are used without the article because they designate not divine attributes, but instances of divine severity and goodness.

This verse states very clearly the necessity of our co-operation with God. We co-operate by a humble faith which ascribes everything to God's grace and mercy, and seeks by inspiring suitable conduct, to show itself worthy of God's mercy.

¹ Von Soden reads ὑψηλοφρόνει.

² Cf. Trent, Sess. vi. *De Justif.*, Can. 23.

Ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ = otherwise thou too shalt be lopped off. For this use of ἐπεὶ cf. iii. 6; xi. 6.

23. The incredulous Jews, on the other hand, may hope to regain God's favour if they abandon their incredulity. This they may hope for all the more, as it is a return to the position inherited from their ancestors. The lopped off branches of the olive will be again engrafted on the tree from which they were cut off. The hope of a return of Israel to God's favour is thus, in a sense, greater than the hope of God's favour for the Gentiles. Paul is obviously not arguing here on the basis of ordinary botanical practice.

24. The Gentiles are but shoots of wild-olive engrafted παρὰ φύσιν—i.e., on a tree differing in nature from their own tree; but the Jews are branches of the tree on which it is proposed to engraft them. But if God has engrafted the shoots of wild-olive, will He not more surely engraft on the fruitful olive its own shoots? Engrafting like on like is easier than engrafting wild olive shoots on the fruitful olive; and if God has done the more difficult, He will surely do what is more easy.

Verse 24 can be thus paraphrased: "If thou hast been cut from a naturally wild-olive (κατὰ φύσιν) and hast been engrafted on a fruitful olive "against nature" (i.e., on an olive of a nature different from thine own), how much more surely shall the natural branches (οἱ κατὰ φύσιν—add, κλάδοι ὄντες) of the fruitful olive be engrafted on their own tree!"¹

Πόσῳ μᾶλλον = "How much more certainly!" rather than, "How much more easily!"

Paul is not arguing here according to customary botanical procedure. God could give flesh and life to the dry bones of Ezekiel's vision (Ezech. xxxvii), so He has power to revivify the dead branches, and attach them to the living tree of His people.

It is generally held that ἀγριέλαιος in v. 17 is an adjective, "Something oleaster-like," while in v. 24 it is a substantive, a wild-olive.

(5) *All Israel will, in the end, be Saved.* XI, 25-32

25. The engrafting of the rejected branches raises the problem: "When shall the mercy of God triumph over the obduracy of Israel?" The answer to this question is given in vv. 25-32.

Ὅτι γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, is a solemn phrase

¹ WW. read: *quanto magis hi secundum naturam inserentur suæ olivæ.*

suggesting the importance of the communication about to be made (*Cf.* i. 13 ; 1 Cor. x. 1 ; xii. i, etc.). His prophecy he calls a "mystery"—*i.e.*, something which was hidden away in God, and has now been made known to men by revelation.¹ The "mystery" in question will serve to warn Gentile Christians not to be wise in their own eyes, imagining that God has turned away absolutely from Israel to concern Himself wholly with the Gentiles.

The content of the mystery is that a portion of Israel will remain obdurate until all the Gentiles have entered the Church, and that then all Israel will accept the Faith.

In *vv.* 5-9 above, Paul showed that a small minority of contemporary Jews had accepted the Faith, while the rest, the great majority of the people, were obdurate. That obdurate section he now describes as a portion (*ἀπὸ μέρους* : it is not the *πῶρῳσις* that is "partial" : *ἀπὸ μέρους* is to be read with *τῷ Ἰσραήλ*). The hardening has "happened" to Israel—*i.e.*, has been permitted by God, and can only be taken away (*vv.* 26 f.) by God. The situation described in *vv.* 5-10 is here recapitulated.

The "mystery," the new teaching now set forth, includes two points: (*a*) The *πῶρῳσις* of the Jews will last until the *πλήρωμα* (the totality) of the Gentiles enters into God's Kingdom. (*b*) Then the *πῶρῳσις* of the unbelieving Jews will be removed by God, and the unbelieving Jews will join the chosen Remnant (*v.* 7). Thus, "All Israel"—which is the sum of the two sections—will be saved.

The *πλήρωμα* of the Gentiles is probably the totality of Gentile peoples—not every individual among the Gentiles. As Augustine puts it : *Omnes gentes promissæ sunt, sed non omnes homines omnium gentium*. Similarly *πᾶς Ἰσραήλ* (the *πλήρωμα* of Israel) does not include each and every Israelite, but the majority of the Israelites living at the time : *πᾶς* is opposed to *ἀπὸ μέρους*. "All Israel" consists, then, of the *ἐκλογὴ* (*v.* 7) and those who will be converted after the Gentiles have "entered in" ;² it is the full sum of those Israelites whom God has efficaciously called.

26-27. The conversion of Israel is certain ; and it is certain that it will follow immediately on the "entering in" of the "totality" of the Gentiles. The prophecy here set forth is not a mere intelligent anticipation, but a genuine prophecy delivered by Paul as one endowed with the charism of

¹ For *μυστήριον* *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 51 ; Eph. iii. 3 ; v. 32.

² "Enter in" is sometimes used in the sense of entering into the Kingdom of God. See ZNW, 1928, p. 165 f.

prophecy (1 Cor. xiv. 6). No hint is given of the means by which the conversion of Israel is to be accomplished; nor is anything said of the eternal fate of those Gentiles and Jews who shall previously die in unbelief (*Cf.* Matth. viii. 12; Mark xiii. 10).¹

It is not clear whether the conversion of Israel is to be thought of as happening at the end of the present age (*cf.* note on ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν above, v. 15) or some fairly considerable time before the General Resurrection.

In confirmation of his prophecy Paul quotes Old Testament and Messianic texts which shadow forth that salvation of Israel which he predicts.

Two passages from Isaías, lix. 20² and xxvii. 9 are cited freely and fused into one which assures "Jacob," or Israel, of the ultimate removal of his iniquity, and the pardon of his sins through the Messiah (the Redeemer). There will be a new "Covenant" connected with the change in the lot of Israel described in v. 23 above. The chief task of the "Redeemer" will be the freeing of "Jacob" (= Israel) from his iniquities,³ and the Covenant in question is intimately associated with, and follows immediately on, that removal of Israel's iniquity. Paul sees in the Isaian text an assurance of the ultimate removal of Israel's special sin—unbelief, and of a national conversion to God, to be consolidated by a new Covenant of God with His Chosen and, henceforth, loyal people (*Cf.* Jer. xxxi. 33 f.). The new Covenant makes it clear that there is question of receiving back into favour the the old Covenant people.

Note that no mention is made here of the period of "Apostasy," nor of the coming of Antichrist (2 Thess. ii. 3). Since, however, the *pleroma* of Israel is made up of those who have received the efficacious call to Salvation, extensive

¹ The phrase, "That ye may not be φρόνιμοι ἐν ἑαυτοῖς" implies that the Gentile Christians, apart from Paul's revelation, might, in imagined wisdom, come to false conclusions about the lot of Israel. There are three readings: (1) παρ' ἑαυτοῖς; (2) ἐν ἑαυτοῖς; (3) ἑαυτοῖς. (1) and (2) are well supported: all have the same sense. For φρόνιμοι, *cf.* xii. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 10. For the thought of the clause, *cf.* Prov. iii. 7; Is. v. 21.

² In the LXX Is. lix. 20 has, καὶ ἥξει ἔφεκεν Σιὼν ὁ ρυόμενος, etc. The Masoretic text reads: "And a Redeemer shall come for Sion, And for those who turn away from rebellion in Jacob." Reading *l'hashibh pésa'* instead of *l'shabhe pesa'*, we get the sense of the Greek, "to turn away rebellion from Jacob." Note how the Pauline text differs from both Masoretes and LXX.

The fusion of Old Testament texts here—as in ix. 33; Matth. ii. 23; iv. 14 f.; xxvii. 9, 10; Mark i. 2, etc.—has parallels in the usage of the Old Testament itself. Compare, for instance, Nehemias viii. 14 f. with Lev. xxiii. 39 ff. and Deut. xvi. 13 ff. Compare also Esdras ix. 10 ff. with Deut. vii. 1 ff.; xxiii. 7 f. See article by H. Kaupel, *Von alttestamentlichen Zitaten im Alten und Neuen Testament*, in *Theologie und Glaube*, 1933, pp. 287-292.

³ WW. read, *impietates*.

apostasies before the End do not affect the Apostolic prophecy. It is not the carnal Israel, as such, but the spiritual Israel that will be saved. The Israel of the spirit will, of course, be the predominant, or the sole Israel, of the final period.

28-29. "In regard to the Gospel" (*i.e.*, because they have, in general, rejected the Gospel) the Jews are "enemies" (*i.e.*, of God, and as such excluded from salvation);¹ and this is for the advantage of the Gentiles (δὲ ὑμῶς), since, as explained above (*vv.* 11 f.), the salvation which was intended for Israel has passed on to the Gentiles. But, looked on from the point of view of the special election of Israel as God's chosen people (κατὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν), the Jews are not "enemies," but "beloved," "on account of the Patriarchs." God promised the Patriarchs to bless their posterity and the gifts of God, and the call which He gives are irrevocable. God never revokes His promises: ἀμεταμέλητα does not mean "unregretted," but irrevocable (= ἀμετάκλητα): the term is technical; and, as Pallis points out, the phrase χάρις ἀναφαίρετος καὶ ἀμετανόητος occurs in Alexandrian legal documents. In 2 Cor. vii. 10, εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀμεταμέλητον is rendered in the Vulgate *in salutem stabilem*. The Vulgate takes ἀμεταμέλητα here in the sense of "unregrettable," "beyond regretting."² The "gifts" (χαρίσματα) in question are those enumerated in ix. 4 f., and the κλῆσις (the "Calling") is the selection of Israel as the special possession of God (=the ἐκλογὴ of *v.* 28). The calling of Israel as God's special people is ἀμεταμέλητος, and, therefore, holds good for ever. The preference implied in God's choice of Israel still continues διὰ τοὺς πατέρας.

It follows, then, that even though the Jews have fallen away through their own fault, they will be taken again into God's favour, as the Gentiles have been. Aquinas, however, notes: *Quod non est sic intelligendum, quasi merita præstita patribus fuerint causa æternæ electionis filiorum: sed quia Deus ab æterno elegit gratis et patres et filios: hoc tamen ordine ut filii propter patres consequerentur salutem: non quasi merita patrum sufficerent ad filiorum salutem, sed per quamdam abundantiam divinæ gratiæ et misericordiæ hoc dicit, quæ intantum patribus est exhibita ut propter promissiones eis factas etiam filii salvarentur*. Rabbinical theology maintained that the merits acquired by the Patriarchs were of permanent

¹ "Enemy" is here used as = "hostile to God," not as = "hated by God." Cf. Luke xix. 27; John xv. 24.

² Aquinas compares 1 Kings xxv. 29 and Ps. cix. 4. Where God is said to "repent" (Gen. vi. 6; Jer. xviii. 9) the meaning is not that in God there is *pænitentia commutatio*, sed quia ad modum pænitentis se habet, dum mutat quod fecerat.

efficacy in the life of Israel. This doctrine was based on Deut. iv. 31: "For a merciful God is Yahweh, thy God: He will not let thee fail, nor destroy thee, and He will not forget the Covenant with thy fathers which He swore to them." Paul, no doubt, has this text also in view, and as it can be verified only through the "entering in" of the *pleroma* of Israel, the permanent value of the Patriarchs' friendship with God is a confirmation of Paul's prophetic revelation of Jewish conversion.

30-32. Several explanations of these verses have been suggested:

(1) The Gentiles ("You") were once disobedient to God, but now they have found mercy, because the Jews are disobedient. Similarly the Jews are now disobedient by reason of your receiving mercy (τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει): they are scandalised at the favour which you, Gentiles, have received; and this has happened that the Jews also may now find mercy.

The calling of the Gentiles has intensified the hostility to the Gospel of the Jews, because it has put the Gentiles on the same religious level as the Jews. Yet this will lead ultimately to the conversion of the Jews, for the purpose of the whole history of man's salvation is to show forth the mercy of God, and the disobedience of men serves normally as the background against which the divine mercy is manifested. As the once disobedient Gentiles have obtained mercy, so will the disobedient Jews also, in their turn, receive it. The shutting up of all in disobedience is the prelude to the manifestation of mercy to all.

(2) In the foregoing explanation of the thought in vv. 30-32, τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει has been read with ἡπειθήσαν as giving the reason of Jewish incredulity (disobedience). It is possible, however, to take τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει as part of the ἵνα clause, so that the following thought results: The Jews have become disobedient through their own fault, that they also, being spurred on by the mercy which the Gentiles have received ("by your mercy"), may be brought to the Faith, and thus find God's mercy. In this view τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει is an instrumental dative, corresponding to τῇ τοῦτων ἀπειθείᾳ, and it is put before ἵνα for emphasis.

This explanation of vv. 30-31 is widely accepted and, in some respects, it is more satisfactory than that given above. As SH graphically show, it gives a really systematic parallelism, and explains the presence of the second οὖν (which, though not accepted by the Vulgate, has the support of NB, etc.) with ἐλεηθῶσι.

The position of τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει before ἵνα is somewhat

awkward, but can, perhaps, be explained, as already said, by Paul's desire to emphasise the part played by Gentile Christianity in bringing about the conversion of "All Israel."¹

Verse 32 is explained by the advocates of (2) as meaning that God has imprisoned all men in disobedience, so that they may realise their guilt and misery and helplessness, and thus be moved to turn humbly to God, and beg for mercy and help (*Cf.* Gal. iii. 22). God never rejects the "contrite and humble heart."

On the basis of the principle laid down in v. 32, the situation of Israel, as outlined in the present context, is that of a people apparently, but not really rejected. For Israel, too, divine mercy stands ready, as soon as the nation has completed its career of error. The Gentiles who have already received mercy are a guidance and light to Israel, leading and urging it on to self-reflection and understanding, until at last Israel humbly accepts the divine mercy which it once despised. In a sense, verse 32 is a resumé of the whole doctrine of grace. God's mercy releases helpless humanity from the prison of its own disobedience!

(3) Some commentators, regarding the position of τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει as excluding it from the ἰνα clause, and unwilling to regard it as giving the cause of Israel's disobedience, make it the object of ἡπειθήσαν. Lagrange renders ἡπειθήσαν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει "They have refused to obey the pardon which is yours." Verse 32 he explains as the statement of a sort of principle that all must pass through a stage of disobedience so as to be brought again into the sphere of influence of divine mercy. Lietzmann also connects like Lagrange, and renders: "They refused to permit themselves to be changed in attitude by the display of God's mercy towards you."

This explanation is less convincing than either (1) or (2). Possibly a fusion of (1) and (2) comes nearest to the thought of Paul. Since the mercy shown to the Gentiles can be regarded as not merely the chief cause or occasion of Jewish hostility to Christianity at present, but also as the chief stimulus to Jewish interest in the Faith in the future, Paul places τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει so that it can be read both with ἡπειθήσαν, and in the ἰνα clause. Jews and Gentiles must all pass through disobedience to the reception of divine mercy; for God's Providence has ordained that only through experience of the self-imposed imprisonment of disobedience can men realise the graciousness of that divine mercy which sets them free.

¹ *Cf.* for transposition of ἰνα, Acts xix. 4; John xiii. 29; Gal. ii. 20, etc.

The ὑμεῖς in *v.* 30 emphasises the Gentile origin of the Roman Christians. The use of ἠπειθήσατε (which Vulgate renders *non credidistis*) rather than ἠπιστήσατε (*cf.* iii. 3) reminds the Romans that their heathen-days were not merely a time of unbelief, but of godlessness and injustice (*cf.* i. 18 ff.)—of “disobedience” generally. The Jewish refusal to accept Christ is also an ἀπειθεία—for they are under an obligation to believe.

The Vulgate in *vestram misericordiam* supposes a view of the passage like (3) above; if (1) or (2), or a fusion of both, is accepted, the Vulgate must be corrected into *vestra misericordia*, or *per vestram misericordiam*.

In *v.* 32 the γάρ introduces the principle of divine providence which is seen at work in *vv.* 30-31.

The construction συνέκλεισεν τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπειθειαν means primarily that God handed all over to disobedience (Vulgate *incredulitas*: WW. read *incredulitatem*) as to a jailor from whom they could not, by their own efforts, escape. We might compare i. 24: παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς . . . εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν, and Ps. lxxvii. 61-62, παρέδωκεν εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῶν . . . συνέκλεισεν εἰς ῥομφαίαν τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ (*Cf.* Gal. iii. 22).

The “all” is to be taken as all men looked at collectively, not as including each and every individual: Paul means by the “all” the Gentiles and Jews whom he has mentioned—τοὺς πάντας. “The above-mentioned—all of them.” Aquinas says rightly: *Fit hic distributio pro generibus populorum et non pro singulis generum*.

With verse 32 ends the treatment of the main theme of the Epistle, as laid down in i. 16*b*, 17. It has been convincingly shown that the Gospel is a power unto salvation for all that believe, and that the justice of God, which is through faith and unto those that believe, is revealed therein.

(6) *Praise of Divine Wisdom.* XI, 33-36

As in viii. 31 ff. Paul ends a main section of his letter by bursting forth into a hymn of praise, so here, at the close of the long doctrinal discussion on the methods of Divine Providence, Paul breaks forth into a hymn of praise and wonder on the wealth of God’s mercy and the transcendence of Divine Wisdom.

33. “Abyss (βᾶθος, *altitudo*) of the wealth and of the Wisdom, and of the Knowledge of God!” The “wealth” is the abundance of divine grace (x. 12—“rich unto all that invoke Him”) and mercy. The Vulgate makes the sense to be, “Oh,

rich depth of wisdom and knowledge," but the Greek makes it clear that all three genitives depend immediately on βᾶθος. The "wisdom" is probably the intelligence of God as decreeing men's salvation, and the "knowledge," the divine omniscience as displayed in executing that decree.

How "unsearchable"¹ are God's κριμματα—the judgments which He passed on Jews and Gentiles in the course of history to bring them to a realisation of their misery and their need of divine assistance. How "untraceable"² His "ways"—the positive paths of grace thrown open to the humbled and repentant Jews and Gentiles.

The ways of Divine Providence are utterly beyond us—unfathomable, impenetrable. In relation to His creatures God is absolutely independent.

34. No creature can boast of knowing the mind of God or of sharing in God's counsels. With the present context should be compared 1 Cor. ii. 7-16. The text in v. 34 is quoted from Is. xl. 13, according to the LXX. The Masoretic text is slightly different:

"Who has determined the spirit of Yahweh?

And who was His counsellor to advise Him?"

No man, then, can know aught of the "judgments" and "ways" of God.

35. This verse is apparently based on the Masoretic text of Job. xli. 3:

מִי הַקְדִּימָנִי וְאַשְׁלֵם

which the Vulgate renders:

Quis ante dedit mihi, ut reddam ei. (The LXX gives a different text.)

The sense is that no man can do a service to God so as to be able to demand a requital. Everything that men possess is God's free gift (*Cf.* 1 Paral. xxix. 14; Job. xxxv. 7).

36. Here we have the ground of the absolute transcendence of God over all creatures. He is the Creator of all things: He conserves all things: He is the goal of all things. From Him everything comes; through Him it is maintained in being, and unto His glory it is destined. The Vulgate *in ipso* represents εἰς αὐτόν. Aquinas, reading *in ipso*, explains: *Omnia (absolute accipiendum pro omnibus quæ habent verum esse) sunt ex ipso, scilicet Deo, sicut ex prima operatrice*

¹ Only here in New Testament. *Cf.* Prov. xxxv. 3; Jer. xvii. 9. The Old Latin has *inscrutabilia*.

² *Cf.* Eph. iii. 8; Job. v. 9; ix. 10. The Vulgate, *investigabiles*, is derived, apparently, from *in* and *vestigare*.

potentia ; omnia autem sunt per ipsum, inquantum omnia facit per suam sapientiam ; omnia sunt in ipso, sicut in bonitate conservante. Aquinas is here misled by the *in ipso* : *per ipsum* refers to conservation, not to creation ; and *εἰς αὐτόν* refers to the purpose, not to the conservation of the universe. Aquinas finds a reference to the Holy Trinity in the Latin text. This is probably not contained in the Greek, for Paul's chief purpose here is to emphasise the utter dependence of creatures, as contrasted with the transcendence of God. God is the sole cause of the universe : it is utterly dependent on Him, and He is its goal.

Lietzmann contends that the thought in *v.* 36 is a product of Stoicism handed on to Hellenistic Judaism through the medium of Hellenistic mysticism.¹ But, however, the phrasing of the verse may be influenced by contemporary philosophical style, the thought is surely quite natural to a Jewish mind.

The Doxology is a suitable conclusion to the dogmatic section of the Epistle. The two doxologies already met with in the Epistle (*i.* 25 ; *ix.* 5) were incidental, provoked by the theme which was being discussed. Here the Doxology, like that at the end of the letter, marks formally the close of a discussion.²

¹ Cf. Norden, *Agnostos Theos.*, Leipzig, 1913, 240 f.

² Cf. Eph. iii. 21, and elsewhere, often. The form of the Doxology here is almost the same as in Gal. i. 5.

B. MORAL SECTION

B. MORAL SECTION

MORAL DUTIES OF CHRISTIANS. XII, 1-XV, 13

(a) GENERAL DUTIES. XII, 1-XIII, 14

(1) *The Christian Life as a Sacrifice offered to God, and a transformation of soul.* XII, 1-2

In verses 1-2 Paul sums up the essential features of the Christian life. That life implies, on the one hand, the offering to God of a body in which impulses to sin have been as far as possible destroyed, and on the other, a service of God which corresponds to the demands of a spiritually enlightened reason.

1. Παράκαλῶ might serve as a heading for the whole moral section of the Epistle.¹ The οὖν connects with the dogmatic teaching above.

The οἰκτιρμοί are the manifestations of divine love and mercy already described. In view of the gracious mercies of God the Romans ought to present to Him a thanksgiving offering. This offering should be their bodies—to be presented to God as a “sacrifice living, and holy, and acceptable to God.”

Παραστῆσαι θυσίαν is a technical term in profane Greek for the offering of a sacrifice: τῷ θεῷ is understood. The thought of offering the body as a sacrifice is similar to that in vi. 13. “Offer yourselves to God as men who have come from death to life, and offer your members to God as weapons of justice” (cf. vi. 19); and it recalls also viii. 13: “For if ye live according to the flesh ye shall die; but if by the spirit ye slay the intrigues of the body, ye shall live.” The mortification of the body by the spirit is a sacrifice, like the Old Testament sacrifices. And as in those sacrifices, so here, the victim must be living, pure, and acceptable to God. Here, though the body has been, in a sense, slain, it is *living* as already potentially delivered from death by its hope of Resurrection. It is “*holy*” as withdrawn from the slavery of sin, and it is pleasing to God because it is now devoted to His service.

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. x. 1.

To present such an offering to God constitutes a λογικὴ λατρεία—i.e., not merely an internal, as distinguished from a purely external, worship, nor a “pneumatic” or exclusively spiritual worship—as the comparison with 1 Pet. ii. 2 (τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα) might suggest, but a worship corresponding to the right reason of the Christian—his reason, that is, as enlightened by grace. Such a reason is in harmony with the mind and will of God, and a manner of worship dictated by such a reason (*Logos*) must be well-pleasing to Christ, and essentially “reasonable” (*rationabile*).

There is no necessity to regard λογικὴ λατρεία as borrowed from the technical terminology of the Hellenistic mysticism of Egypt.

Aquinas points out that in regard to faith, hope, and charity, the Christian is bound by no limit, seeing that the more intensely he believes, hopes, and loves, the better he fulfils God’s will; but in the performance of the external acts which are demanded in the Christian life, measure and proportion are required, and here the control of reason is necessary: “*Cum discretione corpora vestra Deo exhibeatis hostiam, vel per martyrium, vel per abstinenciam, vel per quodcunque opus justitiæ*; 1 Cor. (xiv. 40): ‘*Omnia honeste et secundum ordinem fiant*’ in vobis; et in Psalm. (xcviii. 3): ‘*Honor regis judicium diligit.*’”

2. In the Christian life, then, in which each of the faithful is, in a sense, a priest, who makes offering of his own body as victim to God, there is no place for the spirit that belongs to “this world” (αἰών)—the world that is controlled by the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, Satan’s world. Not after that spirit must Christians fashion themselves: they have put off that spirit with the old man, and have acquired a new mind, and a new spirit: their νοῦς has become, as it were, a πνεῦμα (Eph. iv. 23)—a power elevated and enlightened by grace. The νοῦς of the Christian is “renewed”—made new by rebirth; but even after Baptism concupiscence survives, and practical reason is still wanting in full keenness of perception; hence constant “renewal” of the νοῦς is required. The “renewal” is effected by the practice of the good works of the Christian life (Cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16). Τῇ ἀνακαινώσει is dative of instrument.

The immediate aim of the constant renewing is τὸ δοκιμάζειν in reference to the things that fulfil God’s will—i.e., capacity to discern clearly and definitely the thing that God’s will demands—the thing, that is, which is morally good (τὸ ἀγαθόν), calculated to secure God’s favour (εὐάρεστον), and in every way perfect (τέλειον). As the clouding of passion

is diminished, and the power of the mind is intensified by grace, perception of the things of God becomes clearer and more sure. The "metamorphosis," then, which Christian progress demands, is an ever increasing self-control, and an ever-growing appreciation of the things of God. These can be secured by faithful co-operation with the work of the Holy Spirit.

Lagranger rightly emphasises the contrast between *συνσχηματίζεσθαι* and *μεταμορφοῦσθαι*: *σχῆμα* suggests something external and comparatively unstable (*cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 31): *μορφή* implies what is essential and radical. To fashion oneself on the world of Satan would be to take what is deceitful and transient for something stable and true. The Christian life involves a complete transformation in which the faithful become "*con-formed*" to the likeness of Christ (viii. 29), and "*trans-formed*" into that likeness (2 Cor. iii. 18). Chrysostom remarks: He does not say *μετασχηματίζου*, but *μεταμορφοῦ*, in order to show that that which belongs to the world is mere *σχῆμα*, but that which belongs to virtue is a *μορφή* τις ἀληθῆς φυσικὸν ἔχουσα κάλλος οὐ δεόμενον τῶν ἔξωθεν ἐπιτηριμμάτων τε καὶ σχημάτων, τῶν ὁμοῦ τε φαινομένων καὶ ἀπολλυμένων. Καὶ γὰρ ἅπαντα ταῦτα πρὶν ἢ φανῆναι, λύεται.

Some commentators take ἀγαθόν, εὐάρεστον, and τέλειον as adjectives qualifying θέλημα (Origen, Chrysostom, Aquinas, etc.): this is also the point of view of the Vulgate: *Quæ sit voluntas Dei bona, et beneplacens et perfecta*. It seems better, however, to take the three words as indicating the things which God's will demands (*Cf.* Eph. v. 10).

(2) *Need of a right estimate of oneself and of others.* XII, 3-8

Paul here warns his readers against the danger of over-estimating their own merits, and claims, and thus of growing dissatisfied with their position and work. Christians must realise that they are like members of an organism, each of which has its definite function, and all of which must work together loyally for the good of the whole organism.

3. Λέγω is here equivalent to, "I command." In virtue of the grace of the Apostolate which he has received (i. 5), Paul proceeds to instruct his readers concerning their duties as Christians. He speaks with full Apostolic authority.

The command is given to each and every Roman Christian — παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν: it is given in the form of a *paronomasia* (*Cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 31 f; vii. 31; xiii. 6).

The Romans are not to think more highly of themselves

than they ought to think—or, beyond what they ought to think : they should think, so as to think soberly and sanely (εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν) : σωφρονεῖν according to Chrysostom, implies mental steadiness, simplicity, and soundness : it is the opposite of all that is intemperate, out of bounds, unmeasured.

Ἐκάστῳ ὡς is for ὡς ἕκάστῳ (= ἕκαστος ὡς αὐτῷ) : Paul here gives the test by which it can be determined whether thought and action reach the standard of σωφρονεῖν. The test is the measure of grace and gifts which God has assigned to each one : the thought and action of each one will be a genuine σωφρονεῖν, if they are directed and determined according to that special spiritual endowment—that endowment of charismatic gifts and graces—which God has given to each individual.

The “measure of faith” is not the amount of charismatic faith merely; but the amount of charismatic graces generally, that God has granted in each particular case. Paul calls these gifts faith, either because faith is needed for their reception, or because it is their source, or because the charisms are the fruits of faith. Chrysostom here identifies “faith” with “charism,” and Theodoret practically holds the same view. Beelen explains faith similarly as = “*charismata gratiæ gratis datae*,” of which faith is the root or source. Aquinas explains “measure of faith” as *Mensura donorum quæ ordinantur ad fidei ædificationem*. Lagrange is inclined to see in “measure of faith” an echo of Christ’s promise that men would do great things in proportion to their faith : it seems, however, too narrow a view to limit “faith” in the present passage to charismatic or wonder-working faith.

Each Christian, then, in order to think and act prudently must keep in view that special grace-endowment which he has received for the good of the Church generally. It is the One Spirit that distributes His gifts to all for the good of the whole (Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 11 ff.).

4. The Church is like a human body, the members of which have different functions. Paul works out the same comparison here as in 1 Cor. xii. 12-30.

5. The members have not the same πράξις (= activity, function) : each has its own function, and none can duly perform the function of any other. Christians form one body in Christ (in union with Christ), and He is the Head of that Body (Eph. i. 22 ; iv. 15 ; v. 23). Οἱ πολλοί = “all of us” (as in v. 15). Τὸ δὲ καθ’ εἰς = “but in regard to individuals” : Τό is adverbial accusative : with καθ’ εἰς (which is often explained as a vulgarism)—compare the εἰς καθ’ εἰς

of the Gospels¹ (= ὁ εἰς καθ' ἑνα). Ἀλλήλων μέλη = members belonging to one another. The members belong to one another, and cannot have, therefore, exclusively individual or selfish interests: each must work for the others.

6. The principle laid down in this and the following verses is that every Christian is bound to carry out as fully as he can the duties of the spiritual office which God has assigned to him; it follows from this principle that a Christian may not covet or arrogate to himself the functions of an office to which he has not been called.

The sentence beginning with ἔχοντες ends in an anacoluthon: with *v.* 7 the construction changes, and later it changes again. St. Paul here makes three chief points:

- (a) The faithful form one community in Christ.
- (b) The individual faithful do not exist for themselves: they must help and serve one another.
- (c) God's grace has equipped them with different gifts of the Spirit, and has given them different tasks according to the different gifts of the Spirit they have received; each one is bound to work for the benefit of all and of each within the limits assigned to him by God.

The faithful then have different charismatic equipment (*cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 9-11), and Paul proceeds to illustrate that variety of charisms, adding in each case a brief admonition to the possessors of the various gifts.

The χάρις is charismatic endowment in general: it is the common ground, or basis, of the χαρίσματα.

Of the χαρίσματα prophecy first appears: it must be exercised κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως: "Analogy," here means practically the same as "measure" above; the sense is not that the gift of prophecy depends on the intensity of faith, nor has "analogy of faith" here its usual technical meaning: the general sense is that the Prophet is to speak only that to which the Spirit impels him, and to announce only that which the Spirit reveals to him, or inspires him to make known: he may not interweave with his message material of his own, mere human devisings and conjectures.

Note that Prophecy is put first as the most important charism (*Cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 8, 28).

The sentence: "If we have, prophecy, etc.," is to be completed by προφητεύωμεν.

7. If the gift is διακονία—then let him that possesses it abide

¹ *Cf.* Mark xiv. 19; John viii. 9.

in διακονία (ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ ὧμεν). Paul is not referring here to the order of deaconship, but to every grade of ecclesiastical ministry, every form of service recognised in the community. The man that is charged with a particular διακονία must remain in that service, and not ambition another. For a special kind of διακονία, see 1 Cor. xvi. 15 ; 2 Cor. viii. 4.

If the charismatic person is a Teacher, he must continue to be a teacher. The "teacher" seems to be the same as the man who has the λόγος γνώσεως (1 Cor. xii. 8). Possibly the διδασκαλία, which the Teacher is charged with, is what we call "Catechesis" (Gal. vi. 6 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 19).

The phrase could be completed by ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ἔστω.

The παρακαλῶν may be the man entrusted with the duty of homiletic preaching, just as the Teacher may be the one who is responsible for catechetical instruction. It is not improbable, however, that the παρακαλῶν may have special duties of consoling and strengthening those who were in distress or weak in the faith. The παρακαλῶν must content himself with παράκλησις. We know that prophets and inspired teachers also possessed this gift at times (*Cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 3, 31 ; Acts xiii. 15 ; 1 Tim. iv. 13).

The μεταδιδούς is either the person officially appointed to distribute alms and take care of the poor, or he is one who, in virtue of a special grace, gives up his wealth out of love of God to help the poor (1 Cor. xiii. 3), or for other Church purposes (*Cf.* Chrysostom, Theodoret). To give with simplicity is to give out of charity merely, not to seek glory from men, nor to have any other motive of self-seeking. Chrysostom explains ἐν ἀπλότητι as = abundantly. Add μεταδιδότω.

8. The προϊστάμενος is not the head of the community, but one entrusted with a presidency of some lower type—possibly one in charge of charitable organisations in the community (*cf.* the κυβερνήσεις of 1 Cor. xii. 28) : for such a one there is the rule: προϊστασθω ἐν σπουδῇ—he is to exercise his office with all zeal.

The ἐλεῶν may be one entrusted with the care of the sick or those in prison. For him Paul gives the rule : ἐν ἰλαρότητι ἐλεεῖτο : the "gladness" in question, according to à Lapide, includes three things—gladness of mind, cheerfulness of countenance, and affability of speech (*Cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 7 ; Prov. xxii. 8a).

The various "ministerings" in the Christian community demand, then, in the "ministers" sincerity of motive, ardent zeal, and cheerfulness of disposition.

It is possible to regard the five activities that follow the

διακονία (v. 6) as different ways in which the "ministration" is exercised—by imparting instruction and consolation, on the one hand, and by giving generously with pure motive, by helping in the distribution of alms, and by cheerfully assisting the wretched, on the other. Obviously there is not question in all five offices of purely charismatic activities: an element of ordered officialdom is also implied; but all those "ministerings" are determined by the Holy Spirit and show His workings in the Church: they are tokens and results of the outpouring of the Spirit and, in so far, may be regarded as charismatic.

(3) *Exercise of Charity.* XII, 9-21

Paul here gives directions for the practice of charity towards fellow-Christians (9-13), and towards men generally—including enemies (14-21).

9. In 1 Cor. xiii. 1 charity comes in for treatment immediately after the charisms: so here. Love of the neighbour (which is ultimately based on love of God) must be sincere. Such love sees the evil that is in the neighbour as well as the good: it rejects the evil, and turns to, cleaves to, the good. It is intelligent—not blind or merely instinctive.
10. The Christians are "brothers," and φιλαδελφία is, therefore, the love of one's fellow-Christians. The dative τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ is dative of reference: "In regard to fraternal love be tenderly affectionate towards one another." As to showing to one another marks of respect (τῇ τιμῇ)—each should seek to anticipate the other. Where there is question of special advantages, or more distinguished positions, each one is to be eager to give place to others. The reference, however, is rather to disposition of mind than to manifestations of courtesy and esteem.
11. There is no room in the Christian life for lukewarmness: the principle of that life is the Holy Spirit, whose symbol is fire. The zeal of Christians is to be made ardent by the Holy Spirit; it must be like water that is in a vigorously boiling state (ζέοντες). In Acts xviii. 25 Apollos is described as ζέων τῷ πνεύματι.

The enthusiasm of ardent zeal must always be directed upwards—τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες.

An old reading has here—καίρῳ, instead of κυρίῳ. Jerome rejects it, and, indeed, "taking account of the circumstances of the time" would seem to be out of touch with the context. Yet καίρῳ is well attested, and it is not easy to see how κυρίῳ could have become καίρῳ, whereas the converse process would

be natural enough. If we accept καιρῷ the sense is that zeal must take account of actual circumstances.

The "hope" in which Christians rejoice is the hope of heavenly glory (cf. v. 2 f.): hope is, as Paul shows in v. 3 f., a fruit of patient endurance of affliction: It is only by constant prayer that trouble can be overcome. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 17: Πάντοτε χαίρετε, ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε.

13. Paul turns again to fraternal charity. Christians must take a share in (κοινωνοῦντες) the needs of the Saints—ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἁγίων: the "needs" are the necessities and the afflictions of the brethren ("the Saints"). The Christian regards the troubles of his brethren as his own, and therefore does his utmost to diminish them.

A well-supported reading here is μνείαις (instead of χρείαις): the "remembrances" would = practical remembrance either by prayer, or by giving of alms. The reading χρείαις is more likely, in view of the reference to hospitality that immediately follows.

For the duty of hospitality cf. Heb. xiii. 2; 1 Pet. iv. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8. It would be necessary in regard to the "brethren" who so often had to journey from Church to Church. Some commentators infer from διώκοντες the obligation not merely of receiving strangers, but of going after them, and seeking them out. Hospitality was a very marked feature of the Early Church.

14. Here Paul passes to the imperative. Probably the διώκοντες φιλοξενίαν of v. 13 suggested the thought of "persecutors" (διώκοντας). Paul's outlook here is wider than in the preceding verses, and seems to take in men generally. Εὐλογεῖτε = wish them well,—*eis bona optando et pro eis rogando* (Aquinas). Compare Our Lord's teaching, Matth. v. 44; Luke vi. 28. Chrysostom remarks that St. Paul outlines here the policy not of a philosopher, but of an Angel. The repetition of εὐλογεῖτε is for emphasis. Evil must not be requited by malediction, but by prayer and well-wishing. The prohibition of cursing is here directed, Aquinas says, *Contra quosdam qui ore benedicunt, et corde maledicunt . . . secundum illud* Psalm. xxvii. 3: "*Qui loquuntur pacem cum proximo suo, mala autem in cordibus eorum*": *et etiam contra illos qui quandoque benedicunt, quandoque maledicunt, vel quibusdam benedicunt, quibusdam maledicunt*. Blessing and cursing, as James says, must not come forth from the same mouth, nor, as Peter says, (1 Pet. iv. 9), must Christians "return cursing for cursing."
15. The infinitives χαίρειν and κλαίειν are equivalent to imperatives. Rejoicing with those that are glad and weeping,

with those that weep, imply genuine sympathy with others in all that befalls them. Compare 1 Cor. xii. 26—where, however, the more immediate reference is to the fellow-feeling of Christians for one another as members of the Mystical Body of Christ.

16. Intensity of sympathy with others implies both a community of interest with those others, and a considerable degree of selflessness in those that sympathise. Indifference towards others goes generally with pride. Hence we find τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονεῖν combined with a prohibition of pride. Christians are to be like-minded with others—in the sense that they must regard others as being as important as themselves. They should look on themselves and on others in the same way. This is closely similar to the principle laid down by Our Lord (Luke vi. 31): “As ye would have men do to you, do ye to them in like manner” (Cf. Phil. ii. 2: τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην ἔχοντες σύνψυχοι τὸ ἐν φρονεῖντες.)

Christians must not set their minds on “lofty” things (τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονεῖν)—such as wealth, honour, splendid position, etc. They must be contented with lowly things (τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι)—such as want, ignorance, helplessness, lowly state, etc. These things the faithful are not to shirk: rather must they adapt themselves to them, and so learn to be sympathetic with the lowly and the wretched, and to succour them. This will be a genuine imitation of Christ who took on Himself our miseries in order to end them.

For συναπαγόμενοι (= “giving themselves up to”) cf. Gal. ii. 13; 2 Pet. iii. 17. The commentators are not agreed as to the gender of ταπεινοῖς: the contrast with ὑψηλὰ seems to make it necessary to take it as neuter. Lagrange prefers to take it as masculine, and in this he agrees with Chrysostom.

The two chief obstacles to social harmony are, as Aquinas points out, pride and *præsumptio sapientiæ vel etiam prudentiæ*. The former Paul has dealt with: now he attacks the latter in a text from Proverbs iii. 4, 7: Christians are not to be wise in their own eyes—by regarding themselves as ultra-wise, superior in intelligence, to others, and independent of other people's point of view. Cf. Is. v. 21:

“Woe

To those that are wise in their own eyes

To those that in their own view are astute!”

Prov. iii. 7 is used above in xi. 25 in a somewhat different way. The thought here is that the genuine Christian will be ready to hear, and, when necessary, to defer to, the opinions of others.

17. Lagrange makes reference to outsiders, or non-Christians, to begin here. That view, however, implies that Paul envisages among Christians, persecutors, and proud and overweening men. It is true that in *vv.* 17-21 the wider outlook on the world generally is more definite. Compare with the teaching here (Matth. v. 43 f.; 1 Pet. iii. 9; 1 Cor. xiii. 5, 6).

To aim at good before all men is a teaching based on Prov. iii. 4. The Vulgate here adds from 2 Cor. viii. 21, *non tantum coram Deo, sed etiam*. Paul adds to the Old Testament text πάντων. The Christian seeks to stand well with *all* men, and to give no ground for scandal or excuse for unfriendly criticism to any one (*Cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 2; viii. 21).

18. As far as it depends on themselves Christians are to be at peace with all (*Cf.* 1 Cor. x. 32). Sometimes this is not possible. Chrysostom points out that Scripture itself admits the occasional impossibility of a Christian and non-Christian living together in peaceful marriage (1 Cor. vii. 15); if peace cannot always be maintained by the Christian spouse towards the partner: τί θαυμάζεις, εἰ ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἄλλων τοῦτο οὐ πανταχοῦ δυνατόν. But, so far as they have influence, Christians should work in the cause of harmony and peace-making. For εἰρηνεύοντες *cf.* Mark ix. 50; εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις: *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 13; 2 Cor. xiii. 11.

But their enemies would not leave the Christians in peace, and so Paul goes on to warn his readers not to seek to avenge their own griefs.

19. They are not to avenge themselves (ἐκδικοῦντες); they must leave the avenging to God's "anger"—they must leave scope or "room" for the divine wrath to avenge their wrongs: δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ does not mean, "Give way before the wrath of your enemy!"

The passage quoted is Deut. xxxii. 35: it is quoted again in the same form in Heb. x. 30. The Hebrew *li nakam w'shillem* is rendered freely by the LXX, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω: Paul gives the meaning, without quoting exactly the words of any text (*Cf.* v. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 6.¹

20. Rather (ἀλλά) must we show active charity even to our enemies, if they need it. Paul here quotes Prov. xxv. 21, 22 according to the LXX. By our kindness the enemy will be moved to regret and shame, and these will burn like coals of fire on his head: this will make him conscious of his

¹ WW. read, *mihi vindictam*.

injustice and, in the end, will change him from an enemy into a friend. As Augustine says (*De catech. rud.* 4): *Nulla est major invitatio ad amorem quam praevenire amando.*

SB quotes interesting Rabbinical treatment of Prov. xxv. 21 f. The Hebrew text has *gehālim*—"coals," not "coals of fire," but as glowing coals are meant, "of fire," adds nothing to the sense.

21. The Christian must not let himself be driven by the malice of his foes to requite it with evil. Evil only grows through being requited. Christians must overcome evil by good: by their gentleness they must disarm fierce anger: they must overcome hatred by love. Augustine says (*In Ps.* 47, *enarrat.* 7): *Contra violentiam caritatis mundus nil potest* (*Cf.* Matth. v. 44). Aquinas explains: *Noli vinci a malo, scilicet ejus qui te persequitur, ut tu eum persequaris; sed in bono tuo vince malum illius, ut scilicet ei benefaciendo, eum a malo trahas.*

(4) *Christians and the State.* XIII, 1–7

1. Πᾶσα ψυχὴ is a Hebraism, and wider in its meaning than πᾶς (*Cf.* ii. 9). "Soul" is frequently thus used for "man" in legal enactments in the Old Testament. ὑπερέχουσαι = "ruling" (*Cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 2). The "ruling powers" would include the Emperor, the Senate, pro-consuls, provincial governors, and municipal magistrates. As often elsewhere (*cf.* Matth. viii. 9; Luke vii. 8; xii. 11; Tit. iii. 1) ἐξουσία is used for the concrete—he that holds civil power. The Vulgate *sublimioribus* is misleading, for Paul is not contrasting here higher and lower authorities; ὑπερέχουσαι implies only that the authorities in question are above the individual Christian (*Cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 2; 1 Pet. ii. 13).

ὑποτασσέσθω is reflexive (*cf.* x. 3)—"subject itself to."

St. Paul does not make any distinction between honourable and virtuous rulers, and rulers of a different kind. Chrysostom notes that he does not say simply παῖθεσθω, "obey," but ὑποτασσέσθω.

"There is no authority except from God":¹ this is the reason for the general rule just laid down. The existence of authority—the contrast between rulers and ruled—is due to the will and ordering of God, and not to any social contract. The Christian, then, who is in the position of a subject, is not a servant of men, but of God, and his submission is really paid to God. Paul states here definitely that all

¹ *Cf.* John xi. 9, 11; Dan. ii. 21, 37 f.

existing authorities (αἱ δὲ οὐσαὶ) are established by God. Submission to civil authority is, therefore, obligatory.

It is to be noted that he does not consider the special manner in which governors may attain their power, but only the primary source of their authority. Neither does he speak of any particular form of State, nor of the possibility of rulers setting themselves against God's will. He simply lays down the principle that Christians are bound, as such, to submit to the civil authority which, by God's ordering, or permission, exists. Submission obviously would not be of obligation, nor even lawful, in certain cases—but these Paul does not here consider.

2. It follows from the preceding that those who oppose authority oppose the ordinance of God, and bring on themselves the judgment of God.

Ἀντιπασόμενος implies active opposition, rebellion. Here again Paul is speaking in general only. It is obvious that a Christian cannot obey an authority that prescribes what is essentially sinful. As Aquinas puts it: *Nulli potestati humane est contra Deum obediendum*. God's will cannot oppose itself. Paul himself and the other Apostles resisted civil authority in certain circumstances, and were rewarded by God for doing so (Cf. Acts v. 29).

Διαταγή may mean, (a) disposition, arrangement; (b) ordinance. Here it has the second meaning.

Ἀυθέστηκεν has the force of a present.

Ἐαυτοῖς seems to be equivalent to αὐτοὶ ἑαυτοῖς. Vulgate, *ipsi sibi* (Cf. 1 Cor. xi. 31; Heb. v. 4).

Κρίμα is condemnation (Vulgate, *damnationem*). Though they bring the condemnation on themselves, it is God Who will pronounce it. Their punishment will come from God either directly in this world or the next, or indirectly through human intervention here below.

The general teaching in xiii. 1-2 is that civil government has a right to the obedience of Christians because its authority is from God. But these verses cannot be used as an argument against all revolutionary activity. Normally Paul regards respect for civil authority as a feature of Christian life: but he is not concerned here with the complicated problem of the Church and State.

It may be that Paul has here in view the ardent nationalism of many of his Jewish contemporaries, and its possible perils for Christian peace and progress. He marks off Christianity very strongly from Jewish zealotism, and his teaching in these verses would be very favourably received by the Christians at Rome, who were mainly of Gentile origin.

The insistence on the Christian duty of civil obedience, to be fully appreciated, must be considered in the light of actual conditions in the Roman Empire at the time. It was matter of common knowledge that the Emperor and many of his officials were remarkable neither for justice nor morality.

- 3-4. These verses explain further why those that resist authority bring on themselves punishment. Rulers appointed by God are not objects of fear for those who do good, but they are to be dreaded by those who do evil (*Cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 14). "Good" and "evil" here are not merely obedience and disobedience to civil authority, but what is morally good, or evil, generally. Paul implies that civil authority has the duty of supporting the one, and excluding the other.

Φόβος = object of fear = φοβεροί. The "good work" and the "evil work" mean here "he that does the good deed" and "he that does the evil deed," respectively. Aquinas points out that the principle here laid down holds even when an unjust ruler inflicts punishment on a subject who acts morally: *Non tamen illi qui bene operantur causam habent timendi quia hoc ipsum (i.e., undeserved punishment) si patienter sustinent, in eorum bonum cedit.*

The clause beginning with θέλεις may be taken interrogatively (as in Vulgate), or as the statement of a supposition.

Ἐξ αὐτῆς—i.e., from the civil authority.

Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονος, etc.: It helps the individual to be moral, even though those in whom it is vested are themselves morally inferior. As Aquinas says: *Sicut Deus operatur in bonum his qui bonum agunt* (viii. 28), *ita et principes, si recte ministerium suum impleant; sed et mali principes ministri Dei sunt.*

Φορεῖ (in distinction from φέρει) = carry constantly (*Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 49; Jas. ii. 3). Is Paul thinking here, as some commentators suppose, of the custom of princes and other authorities bearing about with them instruments of punishment, as symbols of their power. Aquinas points to the fasces, and to axes and swords borne before the state authorities.

According to Paul, then, civil authority is at the disposal of God, and does God's work. The sword is the symbol of its power.

As God's servant the State is "an avenger unto the carrying out of wrath"—*ad exsequendam iram Dei*—(Aquinas) on those who do evil. It is surprising to find such an office ascribed to men like Nero.

5. We have here an inference from the principles stated

in vv. 1-4, and particularly from the principle laid down in v. 1.

On account of the great mission and the lofty task of government, Christians must submit to it (ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι: the Vulgate, *Necessitate subditi estote*, presupposes ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθε), not because of the fear of the punishment which the State can inflict as God's "minister," but because such submission is the practical recognition of a divinely established institution. That submission is a religious duty, and corresponds to the demands of conscience (Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 13). One must submit to authority, then, primarily on conscientious grounds, and not through fear of punishment.

6. Διὰ τοῦτο γάρ, etc.: For the same conscientious reason Christians pay (τελείτε = "ye pay," indicative) taxes. The immediate ground of the obligation to pay taxes is that rulers are God's officials (λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ), who devote themselves completely to the carrying out of the duties of their office. The subject here primarily is the ἄρχοντες (v. 3), but the λειτουργοὶ must include also the tax-officials. They are like the λειτουργοὶ in the Temple, for they collect the means necessary for the carrying on of God's work of civil government.

Εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο—to the service of God: to this service the public officials devote themselves completely. In the New Testament and the LXX λειτουργοὶ is used generally as synonymous with δῆκονοι: but here it means holders of public office; the λειτουργοὶ are whole-time officers (προσκαρτεροῦτες = devoting themselves to their work). Cf. Num. xiii. 20; Acts ii. 46; x. 7.

7. Let Christians then satisfy all the just claims of these officials. On this Aquinas says: *Ex quo patet quod ex necessitate justitiæ tenentur subditi sua jura principibus exhibere.*

Though οὖν is not genuine, v. 7 is an inference from the preceding. Πᾶσιν—i.e., the rulers or officials. In what follows we should supply ἀπαιτοῦντι and ἀπόδοτε—"To him that demands tax—pay tax," etc. The Vulgate seems to construe: *Cui tributum [debetis] tributum [reddite]*, as if the Greek were φ, instead of τφ.

Φόρος = direct tax—ground-tax, and poll-tax.

Τέλος = customs, and consumers' tax (i.e., indirect tax).

Φόβος is the reverence due from inferiors to superiors.

Aquinas explains here: *Principi debetur et timor et honor.*

Φόβος and τιμή are to be shown to the higher officials.

(5) *Importance of Charity towards the Neighbour.* XIII, 8-10

8. From the thought of paying debts to officials of State Paul passes in *v.* 8 to the debt of charity. This is the only debt which can never be fully paid. *Ita semel redditur ut tamen semper maneat* (Aquinas). We can never clear ourselves of this debt (*Cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 8 ; i. 22).

Yet though the debt of charity can never be paid, charity itself pays all other debts, since "he that loves the neighbour has fulfilled the Law." Charity sums up in itself all the commandments of the Decalogue, and it must, therefore, go on binding for ever.

The "Law" which charity fulfils, according to some commentators, is the Mosaic Law on its moral side (the so-called Law of the Second Table); other commentators take it as including, not any part of the Mosaic Law in particular, but the eternal Law of God in general. The phrase used here, "the rest of the Law" as well as the context (*vv.* 9-10), seem, however, to imply that the "Law" which charity fulfils is the whole body of Mosaic Law, in which the obligation to neighbourly love was included. The point is that by the fulfilling of the law of neighbourly charity the other precepts of the Mosaic Code were also fulfilled—as Christ Himself practically taught (Matth. xxii. 40 and parallels). The fulfilment of the law of charity to the neighbour is only fully possible through the power of God's love, as Paul showed in chapter VIII. Aquinas says: *In dilectione proximi includitur dilectio Dei sicut causa in effectu. Et e converso dilectio proximi includitur in dilectione Dei, sicut effectus in causa.*

9. Here we have a proof of 8b. Paul takes a number of precepts of the Decalogue, and shows that they are all summed up in the Law of Charity. Note that the precepts of the Decalogue appear here in an order different from that of the Hebrew text (Exod. xx. 13 ff.; Deut. v. 17 ff.). The order of the Commandments here is (omitting 4 and 8) 6, 5, 7, 9, 10: this is the order in the B text of Deut. v., and in Mark x. 19 and Luke xviii. 20, as well as in Philo and the Papyrus Nash. WW. omit *non falsum testimonium dices*.

The phrase εἰ τις, etc., indicates that Paul wishes to quote only a few illustrations.

Ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται = summarised. Vulgate has *instauratur* (*Cf.* Eph. i. 10).

10. This is a repetition in substance of *vv.* 8, 9. Charity is a fulfilment of the Law, for Charity inflicts no evil on the neighbour, and the whole Law is concerned with the prohibition of such infliction of evil. It has been pointed out

that there may be here the suggestion that charity to the neighbour is the realisation of the Israelite ideal of conduct towards one's fellows as outlined in the Second Table of the Law (Exod. xx. 13 ff.). But if the Law in *v.* 8 includes more than the Second Table it must be taken in the same wider sense here.

Πλήρωμα has here a passive meaning—that by which the Law is completely fulfilled.

(6) *The critical needs of the time.* XIII, 11-14

11. Καὶ τοῦτο—the τοῦτο refers to the exhortation to brotherly love in verses 8-10: καὶ τοῦτο = “and that too,” “and especially.”

And this precept of brotherly love ye ought to observe (implied in ὀφείλετε), because ye know (εἰδότες) the immense importance of the time in which ye live (τὸν καιρὸν: the season, or period for the working out of salvation)—because ye know that it is high time to awake from the sleep of sin and indifference.

Paul has just proved that the precept of fraternal love summarises the Decalogue. To observe that precept thoroughly is, therefore, the chief means of working out salvation, and the season granted for that great task is growing rapidly shorter. In 1 Thess. v. 6 ff. the need of waking and watching is developed in detail. Cf. also Heb. x. 25, Καὶ τοσοῦτω μᾶλλον ὅσω βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσιν τὴν ἡμέραν. In speaking here of the need of waking from sleep Paul does not accuse the Romans of coldness or indifference in regard to the Faith. His words are applicable to Christians of all times and places. Besides, in what follows, he puts himself along with his readers—if the reading ἡμῶς is correct.

Νῦν γάρ, etc.: This gives a reason for the ὅτι clause. “Salvation”—i.e., final salvation, is nearer to us (taking ἡμῶν with ἐγγύτερον, not, as the Vulgate does, with σωτηρίᾳ) now than when each of us first received the Faith. The time which remains to prepare for σωτηρία is growing shorter, and becoming, therefore, increasingly important.

Though the Apostle here speaks of the shortness of the time that is left to prepare for salvation, he does not imply that the coming of the Lord is close at hand. Paul knew that the date of the Parousia was uncertain (Cf. 1 Thess. vi. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 15; cf. also Matth. xxiv. 36). The Christian period was for Paul the final period of the history of “salvation” (cf. 1 Cor. x. 11; 1 Pet. i. 20; Heb. i. 1), and

within that period the Parousia is to take place. Paul could not say that the Parousia would happen in his own life-time, or during the life-time of his readers. For each individual Christian death means a coming of the Lord, and that coming would be near at hand for all.

12. Ἡ νύξ προέκοπεν, etc.: Here begins a more general exhortation to vigilance and effort in the Christian life. The "night" is not the pre-Christian period generally, nor the period of the Mosaic Law in particular; neither is it, probably, the present life of the faithful, nor the present life generally, but the period in which, through Satan's power, heathenism and Jewish obduracy and sin generally prevailed. That period is now far advanced (προέκοπεν—not as Vulgate has it, *præcessit*; *processit* would be better), and the "day" of eternal life is near.¹ Satan's power was broken by Christ, but even in the Christian period its influence, though waning, can still be seen in the world. Thus the present period is a sort of dawn which lies between the world's night of sin and the perfect day of the Parousia.

Since then the night of sin is ending, and the dawn of salvation is close at hand, we must put aside the works of darkness—the sinful works, which belong to the realm of the night, and the darkness of "this world"—the works which come from darkness and lead to darkness. As citizens of the Kingdom of Light we must put on "the weapons of light." The weapons and armour of light are described in Eph. vi. 13 ff.—the girdle of truth, the breast-plate of justice, the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, and the sword of God's word. We, who belong to the day, as Paul says in 1 Thess. v. 8, should be clad with the coat-of-mail of faith and love, and with the helmet of salvation. We have to do battle against the flesh and against the powers of darkness.

Ἀποθώμεθα—putting away the garments of night (Acts vii. 58). The reading ἀποβαλώμεθα in D and G may be due to the influence of the Latin *abjiciamus*.² The works of darkness (*vide supra*) are to be put off, or laid aside, like garments. Notice that Paul does not go on to say that the *works* of light are to be put on—but the *weapons* of light (though AD 32, 93 have ἔργα τοῦ φωτός): the weapons of light are virtues, rather than acts of virtue; they are the armoury which God supplies for the spiritual combat, which has to be waged: πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου,

¹ WW. read, *adpropiauit*.

² *Deponamus* would give the real sense.

πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (Eph. vi. 12). The "Day of the Lord" is dawning, but it will not appear in full brightness until the Parousia.

13. We "belong to the day" (1 Thess. v. 8), and we must, therefore, "go about" (= live, conduct ourselves), as it were, in full daylight (ὥς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ = ὥς οὐσῆς ἡμέρας); εὐσχημόνως (becomingly, respectably), realising that the eyes of God and the eyes of men are upon us.

Μὴ κώμοις, etc.: We have here some concrete specimens of the ἔργα τοῦ σκότους—such as were common in the heathen world. The datives are datives of manner (note the Vulgate, *in*): the plurals suggest the frequent occurrence of the things named. Cf. Gal. v. 19-21 for the ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, which include some of the "works of darkness" here enumerated. In 1 Pet. iv. 3 we have a similar list of vices popular among the heathens, which Christianity abhors.

Here the vices are grouped in pairs, each of which practically forms a hendiadys—banquets where there is drunkenness, couches on which there is debauchery, quarrels which spring from passionate jealousy (So Lagrange). Lagrange aptly quotes Suetonius' story of the nightly doings of Nero (Suetonius, Nero, xxvi.).

14. Putting off the works of darkness, Christians must "put on Christ"—that is, unite themselves so fully with Christ as to have community of life with Him—to be "other Christs" in action, outlook, and in all the ordering of life.

It is true that Christians have put on Christ at baptism (Gal. iii. 27); but that putting on must be renewed again and again, and be constantly more thorough going. Aquinas explains: *Dicitur induere Christum qui Christum imitatur quia sicut homo continetur vestimento, et sub ejus colore videtur . . . ita in eo qui Christum imitatur opera Christi apparent. Per hoc induimur arma lucis quando induimus Christum.*

For the idea of "putting on Christ," cf. Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10.

- 14b. Paul does not prohibit care for the flesh: the lawfulness of such care he takes for granted (1 Tim. v. 23: cf. Acts xxvii. 3). But the flesh must be so cared for that it remains a ready instrument for the spirit.

For πρόνοια cf. xii. 17; 2 Cor. viii. 21; 1 Tim. v. 8.

The use of σὰρξ suggests that Paul is thinking here of the sensual impulses which still remain even when Original Sin has been removed: this is suggested still more clearly by εἰς ἐπιθυμίᾳς (the Vulgate, *in desideriis*, is the equivalent in Vulgar Latin). The flesh is to be so cared for that the evil concupiscences which slumber in it may not be aroused.

(b) THE "WEAK" AND THE "STRONG." XIV, 1-XV, 13

(1) *The need of mutual toleration in regard to "foods" and "days."* XIV, 1-12

The instructions given in chapters XII and XIII are general in character. Paul now takes up a special problem of early Christian life which existed, or might naturally be presumed to exist, in Rome. The Christian community in such a world-centre as Rome must have been very heterogeneous in composition. It comprised, in all probability, a strong minority of Jews, and its converts from heathenism must have included people who had professed the most widely differing forms of Pagan religion. Yet it was essential that at Rome, as elsewhere, mutual understanding and toleration and general harmony should prevail among the faithful. In Rome, however, as at Corinth (*cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 1-11; 2 Cor. xi. 29), the unity and peace of Christian life were exposed to certain dangers which had their roots in the pre-conversion lives of the faithful. One of these was what Paul calls a "weakness in faith." This was not, it appears, a tendency to doubt the truths of the Gospel, but rather a certain scrupulosity or individualism, in regard to what was lawful and obligatory in the practical profession of the Faith in daily conduct. At Corinth there was the difficulty that some Christians refused to eat at private banquets meats that in anyway had been offered to idols (1 Cor. x. 25-30)—even though the idols in question were mere nothings (*Cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 7). In Rome, it would seem, there were faithful who were still more strict than the Corinthians, and refused to eat meat at any time (xiv. 2), and were also, apparently, opposed to the use of wine (xiv. 21): These people, who are here spoken of as "the weak," also selected certain days for special observances (xiv. 5). These tendencies to an individualism which threatened to disrupt the harmony of Christian life, Paul ascribes to a weakness, or imperfection, of faith—to a lack of ripe understanding—which was due somehow to the persistence in the converts of prejudices and habits from their earlier pre-conversion career. It seems clear that the "weak" were in a minority in the Roman Church, but the situation which the present chapter supposes is by no means clear in all details. It is not evident, for instance, whether the abstainers from meat and wine were Jewish Christians of an ultra-ascetic type, or converts from some form of Orphic-Pythagorean Mystery-religion.¹

¹*Cf.* Rauer, *Die Schwachen in Korinth und Rom nach den Paulusbriefen.* *Biblische Studien* xxi. 2/3. Freiburg, 1929.

The common opinion of exegetes regards the "weak" at Rome as mainly of Jewish origin on account of the use of the Jewish technical word, "common" (v. 14). Yet something more seems to be implied in the attitude of the "weak" than abstention from meats regarded as unclean, or common, by the Mosaic Law. Complete abstention from meat and wine is here discussed—and such abstention was not, *per se*, a feature of Judaism. It seems, however, that in xv. 7–9 the "weak" are contrasted, as men of the circumcision, with Gentile Christians.

There is also uncertainty about the groups that select certain days for special observance, and about the purpose for which the days are set apart. Some scholars think that the days selected by the "weak" are fast-days: others, that they are festival-days.

If the "days" are fast days, the contrast would be between those who fast on certain days and those who fast every day; it can scarcely be between those who fast on certain specific days and those who never fast at all. Just as all early Christians kept certain days holy, so they also probably kept certain days as fast days.

If the "days" are festival days the contrast is between those who regarded all days—all week-days, that is—as of equal importance, and those who set apart certain week-days as days of special solemnity.

Since the context deals with abstinence from meats and wine, it is antecedently more probable that the "days" are fast-days rather than feast-days. The prohibition of fasting on Mondays and Thursdays contained in the *Didache* (viii.) supports this view.

Moreover, Paul himself, who evidently cannot be reckoned here among the "weak," observed the Sabbath and other Jewish feasts—and would, therefore, be unlikely to suggest that others who did the same were "weak" in faith.

In the diversities of standpoint here outlined there is, as was said above, no question of teachings against the Faith, or of any attempt to overthrow the freedom of the Gospel. Hence Paul deals gently with the situation.

He does not accept the views of the "weak," but neither does he formally condemn their conduct. Abstention from certain foods and supererogatory fasting are practices quite harmless in themselves: but if they tend to disturb Christian harmony, or to obstruct the fulfilment of the precept of fraternal charity, they must be abolished.

Paul's teaching on the mutual relations of the "weak"

and the rest of the brethren may be summarised in three precepts :

- (a) Judge not thy brother (xiv. 1-12).
- (b) Scandalise not thy brother (xiv. 13-23).
- (c) Be considerate and tolerant towards all (xv. 1-13).

(a) Judge not thy brother (XIV, 1-12).

1-2. Τὸν δὲ ἄσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει, etc.: The "weak in faith" is one who fails to judge things generally by faith—one who is not sufficiently advanced in the Faith to be quite clear about its practical demands.

Possibly the epithet "weak" was invented by an opposite party, or group, which, for the moment, is not named. Plainly the "weak" are a minority in the Church: but the text does not show clearly whether they are isolated individuals, or form a definite, more or less united, group. "Faith" means here moral conviction.

Προσλαμβάνεσθε—"take into your company," "take up," "give a welcome to." The word has in the context the special sense, "Receive in brotherly love!" Paul is not thinking here merely of the *Agape* and other community feasts and festivals, but of personal intercourse in everyday life as well. The "weak" are Christians, and there can, therefore, be no question of receiving them into the Church. Neither is there any hint that the Church has, in any way, broken with the "weak."

Μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν: If the weak are taken up and received into friendship by their "stronger" brethren, there must be no unfriendly criticism (διακρίσεις) of points of view (διαλογισμῶν) on either side. The "strong" must avoid contemptuous criticism of the scruples of the "weak"; and the "weak" must abstain from judging the free attitude of the "strong."

Since προσλαμβάνεσθε is addressed to those who are not "weak," it seems to follow that the "weak" in question are a minority.

Ὅς μὲν πιστεύει, etc.: The "strong" are sufficiently firm in faith to be convinced (πιστεύω = θαρρῶ) that they may eat without scruple any kind of food. The "weak," on the other, have such scruples about meats that they will eat vegetables only (*Manducet* of the Vulgate should be *manducat*). The "weak" in the case, therefore, are vegetarians (like the Orphics, and the Thracian initiates of Dionysos, and the Pythagoreans); they did not merely distinguish between things clean and unclean according to the Mosaic Code; nor

were they merely scrupulous (like many Christians in Corinth : 1 Cor. viii. 1 ff.) about meats that had somehow been offered to idols ; but they avoided meat altogether.

3. The "strong" must not despise the "weak" for his scruples, nor the "weak" the "strong" for his apparent lack of scruple. God has received both the "weak" and the more liberal-minded into His Church (προσελάβετο) : each must therefore regard the other as his brother, and neither must judge the other. It is usual to limit αὐτόν to the "strong" : but it is probably better to take it as referring both to the ἐσθίων and the μὴ ἐσθίων.

There is a lesson here for the treatment of the scrupulous, and there is a warning also to the scrupulous not to misjudge the freedom of normal folk. This warning is emphasised in v. 4.

4. When the "weak" criticises the "strong" he arrogates to himself the rights of Christ, who is the Lord and Master of every Christian. The "strong" Christian is the slave of Christ, and to Christ, therefore, not to the "weak," belongs the right of judging His "slaves" : Οἰκέτην = οἰκεῖον. (Cf. Gal. vi. 10 ; Eph. ii. 19 ; Luke xvi. 13 ; 1 Pet. ii. 18).

Ἀλλότριον = belonging to another person, or belonging to another master (John x. 5 ; Heb. ix. 25).

"Standing" and "falling" = persistence and failure in faith and grace, respectively (Cf. 2 Cor. x. 12). It is to his own Master (τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ is dative of advantage) that a man brings credit or disadvantage : and to his Master the slave is responsible. It is the Master alone who can judge whether His servant "stands" or "falls." There is therefore no room for carping criticism on the part of outsiders. Each one should be concerned for himself alone—unless, of course, his position or office imposes upon him duties of supervision and direction.¹ The more common view which takes v. 4 as a warning for the "weak," and not for the others (against Chrysostom, etc.), seems to be psychologically more probable : it is not likely that the "strong" would be greatly concerned about the doings of others.

But the "strong" Christian, who is unfavourably criticised, will "stand" because God, Who has called him to the Church, and to the service of Christ, is powerful enough to maintain him ; and in His goodness and loyalty, God will maintain him.² It is not the criticism of his fellow-slave that will

¹ And such supervision or criticism is lawful, as Aquinas says, only *inquantum agitur auctoritate concessa divinitus* : it is, therefore, a sort of participation in the criticism of the Master Himself on His servants.

² Note that in the Vulgate ὁ κύριος is represented by *Deus* : ὁ θεός, which is the reading of several MSS., is an adaptation to v. 3.

sustain him, but the grace of God. It is particularly foolish for one servant of Christ to judge another, in cases in which the ethical or religious value of the other's actions depends mainly on the subjectivity of the agent. Aquinas well summarises the Pauline doctrine of fraternal criticism thus : *Debemus Deo proximorum iudicia relinquere, nisi in quantum vice ipsius fungimur in iudicando, per auctoritatem nobis commissam.* Hence Aquinas goes on, even *Si videmus aliquem manifeste cadentem, non debemus eum despicere, temerarie de eo iudicando quod numquam resurget ; sed magis debemus præsumere quod iterum stabit, non ex consideratione conditionis humanæ, sed considerando virtutem divinam.*

For the unusual word $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ compare 2 Cor. xiii. 3 ; later MSS. substitute $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$.

5. "Ὅς μὲν γὰρ, etc. : If we read γὰρ, it is a particle of continuation : it does not introduce a reason, or ground. But it may be an interpolation—as Gutjahr thinks. "Judging one day more than another," must refer, as has been said above, either to the fixing of fast days or feast-days. That fast-days are referred to is, as we have seen, the more probable view. But how are the different groups put in relation to the fast-days ?

Rauer holds that Paul has three groups of Christians in view :

- (a) Those who always fast ($\delta\ \mu\eta\ \epsilon\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\omega\nu = \text{o}\acute{\iota}\ \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\nu$).
- (b) Those who fast on certain specific days (= $\delta\ \phi\rho\omicron\nu\omega\acute{\nu}\ \tau\eta\nu\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho'\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\nu$).
- (c) The "strong" ($\delta\ \epsilon\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$) who eat everything, and do not fast at all.

Since, however, the existence of such a group as Rauer's (c) is unlikely, it is better to see here only two groups :

- (1) Those that fast on certain days only ($\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho'\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\nu$). These are the "strong."
- (2) The $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\nu$ = those that fast every day.

In this view *v.* 5 is a sort of extension or explanation of *v.* 2. The choice of foods is made the ground of dispute in *v.* 2 : in *v.* 5 it is taken up from a different angle. The "strong," or the meat-eaters, sometimes abstain from meat, but that abstinence is observed on certain days only : on such days, then, the "strong" and the "weak" are at one in their attitude towards meats. It follows, therefore, that there is no far-reaching or deep-going difference between the two groups : there is between them a comparatively trivial

difference of attitude, and that not always. Hence each group should be allowed to follow its own conviction—or, as Paul puts it : ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοὶ πληροφορεῖσθω : “ Let each one adhere with full assurance to his own conviction.” The Vulgate, *unusquisque in suo sensu abundet*, is not a satisfactory rendering. The man who follows his own clear conviction in this matter of foods and days is in a safe position.

For πληροφορεῖσθω cf. iv. 21 : the substantive πληροφορία means full assurance, firm conviction.

In this verse κρίνειν cannot mean “ judge,” merely : it must mean “ select,” or “ choose ” (perhaps, judge in favour of one as against the other) : cf. 1 Cor. ii. 2 ; vii. 37 ; 2 Cor. ii. 1 ; παρὰ has here a comparative meaning (Cf. i. 25 ; Luke xiii. 2 ; Heb. i. 4).

6. ‘Ο φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν, etc. : “ He that has the day in mind ” (=he that puts one day above another, v. 5), has it in mind for the Lord :¹ similarly he that eats, eats for the Lord—i.e., to honour the Lord : he eats meats and abstains from meats on certain days, not out of caprice, but because he is convinced that it pleases the Lord : his intention is right, as is plain from the recital of grace in connection with the taking of food (εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ θεῷ).

On the other hand, the Christian who abstains from meat always, also gives thanks to God in connection with meals and, therefore, acts just as obviously with a good intention when he fasts, as the other does, whether he eats or fasts.

7. Here we have the reason why everything should be directed to God’s glory, in regard to foods and days. Since Baptism none of us is his own master ; the old self-seeking ego is dead (Gal. ii. 20), and we live altogether for God.
8. The whole purpose of the Christian’s life is the service of Christ : he is the δοῦλος Χριστοῦ, and is entirely in his Master’s hand. And even when he dies, he dies for the Lord, since the dead also belongs to the Lord.
9. Christ died and entered into His glorious life (ἐξῆσεν) that by dying, and descending to the world of the dead, and rising to glory He might become Lord and Ruler of the dead and the living. By His Atonement Christ has made us His special possession, not only in this world, but (still more) in the world to come. In Phil. ii. 8 a similar idea is expressed when Paul asserts that because Jesus humbled Himself to the death of the cross, He was made Lord over heaven, earth, and the underworld.

¹ Some texts add here καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν κυρίῳ οὐ φρονεῖ, but this is an interpolation.

The Vulgate *resurrexit* (for ἐξησεν), is due to the reading ἀνέστη. The reading ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἐξησεν occurs, and also, ἐξησεν καὶ ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη.

10. Since Christians belong wholly to the Lord, it is absurd for them to judge one another. Paul here apostrophises first the "weak," and then the "strong" Christian. How can the "weak" Christian judge the "strong" Christian regarding his use of meats, and how can the "strong" despise the "weak" brother who abstains from meat? Both belong to Christ, and it is for God alone to judge either or both of them.

Moreover, it is most foolish for one of us to judge the other, for we shall *all* have to appear before God's judgment seat: judgment belongs to God, and he that judges his brother usurps the rights of God. The Vulgate *tribunal Christi* ought to be *tribunal Dei* (according to B N A C and Vet. Lat.). God will judge the world through Christ (*Cf.* 2 Cor. v. 10).¹

To show that all will appear before the judgment-seat of God, Paul quotes freely Is. xlv. 23 and xlix. 18:

Is. xlv. 23: *By myself I have sworn*

.
.

That to me will bend every knee

And every tongue swear!

xlix. 18: "*As I live—is the Oracle of Yahweh.*"

Paul has ἐξομολογήσεται for the LXX ὁμῆται; "I live" is a swear-formula—*Hai* ^{ani}, which often occurs in the Old Testament. God swears by Himself—*quia non habet majorem in quo major firmitas consistat veritatis* (Aq., *cf.* Heb. vi. 13, 16). The Isaian passage, xlv. 23, is quoted again in Phil. ii. 10 f. The world-rule of Yahweh, which the Isaian text immediately announces, implies the judgment of the world by God, so that the text is as suitably quoted here in Romans as it is in the description of Christ's glorification in Philippians. It should be noted that what the present passage predicates of God is referred to Christ in Phil. ii. 10, 11.

12. Before God's tribunal we shall have to give reckoning concerning ourselves—not concerning others. The text concerning superiors in Heb. xiii. 17 is not in opposition to this teaching—*quod in hoc ipso quod praelati pro aliis rationem reddent, reddent rationem pro suis actibus quos circa subditos agere debuerunt* (Aquinas).

¹ WW. read, *Dei*.

(b) *Scandalise not thy brother!* XIV, 13-23

It is not enough that the "strong" and the "weak" should be tolerant of one another's points of view. Charity demands not merely toleration, but concession, and self-restriction. As in 1 Cor. viii. 9, 13; ix. 22, and elsewhere, Paul insists here on the duty of avoiding scandal. The more liberal-minded Christians must be ready to make concessions to the point of view of their more scrupulous brethren. The "strong" must, at times, adapt themselves to the attitude of the "weak," lest the weak be scandalised.

13. Μηκέτι . . . κρίνωμεν is the practical inference from all the foregoing. Paul turns at once to warn the "strong" against the full use of their freedom: τοῦτο κρίνατε = "decide on this line of action": this use of κρίναι, in another sense, makes a vivid contrast: "Do not judge your brethren, judge this for yourself—take this as your definite line of conduct."

The Vulgate *magis* ought to be *potius* (μᾶλλον).

Πρόσκομμα is a more or less accidental obstacle: σκάνδαλον is an obstacle maliciously set in one's path (cf. ix. 30 f.); the "obstacles" = anything that might lead to sin. The "strong" must see that his conduct does not become such an "obstacle," or stumbling-block, for the weaker brethren.

14. Οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι, etc.: This is a solemn asseveration of Paul's conviction as a Christian: ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, in his union with the Lord: cf. Phil. ii. 24; 2 Thess. iii. 4; 2 Cor. xii. 19; Gal. v. 10: the Lord is the source of both his knowledge and conviction. Paul is obviously referring here to definite assertions of Our Lord, such as Mark vii. 15; Matth. xv. 11. But the special enlightenment which he himself has received from the Lord is also implied.¹ As one who has left Judaism, and thrown off the yoke of the Mosaic Law, Paul knows that no food is, of itself (δὲ ἑαυτοῦ: Vulgate, *per ipsum* ought to be *per seipsum*),² unclean (κοινόν): his knowledge is supernatural in origin and character.

But while a food, considered in itself alone, is not unclean, it may become unclean in a particular case: if an individual is subjectively convinced that a food is unclean, and yet eats it, that food is unclean for him, and makes him unclean. This is a case, of course, of erroneous conscience; but it might easily occur with Jewish Christians. These might still be convinced (though not ἐν κυρίῳ) that the flesh of

¹ Cf. the special illumination given to Peter on this matter: Acts x. 9-17.

² The reading δὲ αὐτοῦ—through Him, *i.e.*, through Christ, which is represented in the Vulgate, is less strongly supported.

creatures strangled, or swine-flesh, or blood, etc., was unclean. This attitude must be taken into account by the "strong."

15. Fraternal charity may oblige us then, in certain cases, to abstain from foods which in themselves are lawful. For if we eat in despite of a brother's scruples we sadden the brother and do not walk according to the genuine spirit of Christianity.

With εἰ γάρ (not εἰ δέ) is introduced the reason for the precept laid down in v. 13. V. 14 is a sort of parenthesis.

Paul seems to mean here that if the "weak" Christian sees his brother eating a food that he himself regards as unclean, he may become involved in a conflict with his own conscience, and may be induced, in the end, to follow the example of his "strong" brother, and, thus, sin (Cf. the similar situation in 1 Cor. viii. 7-13). If the "strong" allows this to happen, he ceases to act according to the demands of charity. Lagrange seems to think that the "grief" of the "weak" brother here is his remorse at having offended God: it might, however, be explained as his vexation at the indifference of the "strong" to his scruples, which may ultimately have the effect of driving him back to Judaism.

Charity obviously requires that the stronger Christian should forego his rights in the case, and give up his higher wisdom, rather than cause the fall of his brother for whom Christ died. The importance of the brother's salvation is seen from the death of Christ. Τῷ βρώματί σου = "by something so trivial as thy food": ἀπόλλυε refers to eternal ruin. Cf. the parallel in 1 Cor. viii. 11: ἀπόλλυται γάρ ὁ ἀσθενῶν ἐν τῇ σῇ γνώσει ὁ ἀδελφὸς δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν.

16. "Your good" (the better attested reading—instead of *our* good: Vulgate, *bonum nostrum*) is the sense of Christian freedom, or the Christian ideal, which is upheld by the "strong" (Cf. "My freedom": 1 Cor. x. 29). It must not be allowed to become a ground of objection (μὴ βλασφημίσθω) against themselves. The objection would be that their "freedom" was a scandal, or source of destruction, to their brethren. This objection would, apparently, come from the "weaker" brethren themselves—after their fall. Criticism like this would give rise to disputes and controversies in the Church, which might, in the end, lead the faithful to lose sight of the real meaning of Christianity.

Other commentators think that the "blasphemy" to be guarded against is the criticism of non-Christians, which would be roused by unbrotherly conduct of Christians among themselves. In this view ὑμῶν would include the whole

community, and not the "strong" ones, merely. The context, however, which seems to have in view the situation *within* the Christian community, is not in harmony with this explanation.

17. Justice, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit—not eating and drinking, make up the Kingdom of God: the justice is that which comes through faith (iii. 22); the peace is peace with God (v. 1) and the brethren (xii. 18); the joy in the Holy Spirit is the joy which springs from justice and peace (vv. 1, 2), or that which proceeds from Christian hope and charity (Phil. iii. 1): justice, peace and joy are, then, the fruits of justification (v. 1 ff.). They are not merely the social virtues that belong distinctively to Christians, but supernatural virtues that manifest themselves in Christian social life. It is possible to take ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ with all three, but it is more natural to connect it mainly with χαρά (Cf. 1 Thess. i. 6: both peace and joy appear among the fruits of the Spirit in Gal. v. 22: cf. viii. 9; v. 5).

The Vulgate *esca* does not exactly reproduce the Greek: the text speaks of eating and drinking, not of foods and drinks. WW. omit *enim*.

Bousset (*Judentum* (3), 318) compares *Berachoth*, xviii. as a parallel to v. 17: In the world to come there is neither eating nor drinking, nor begetting, nor increase, etc. While this passage may have some value as a Rabbinical illustration of Matth. xxii. 30, it is quite irrelevant in regard to the present verse.

18. Ἐν τούτῳ refers to the three things just mentioned: it must not be referred to πνεύματι: it means, "along these lines," "on the principles implied in these virtues." Estius paraphrases: *Qui in eo, quod dixi, i.e., in virtutibus, quas recensui, studet Christo servire, acceptus est Deo et hominibus; Deo, quia per illas virtutes promovet in se regnum Dei, hominibus quia pacem conservat.*

For εὐάρεστος cf. xii. 1; for δόκιμος see 1 Cor. xi. 19; 2 Cor. x. 18; xiii. 7; Jas. i. 12.

A life of union with Christ, in justice, peace, and joy, secures the favour of God, and the respect of men: it excludes all possibility of "blaspheming" against the faithful from within and without (Cf. xii. 17).

19. The reading διώκωμεν is supported by the context and by several authorities (D C; Vet. Lat.; Vulg., etc.). Διώκομεν is also well supported (B X, etc.), and SH regard διώκωμεν as a correction. The Vulgate *custodiamus* translates a φυλάξωμεν—which is apparently a scribal addition to the verse. For this use of διώκειν cf. xii. 13; 1 Cor. xiv. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 11.

Christians are not merely to strive after peace with others : they must also seek to "build up" the brethren spiritually. For οἰκοδομή cf. xv. 2 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 5 ; 2 Cor. x. 8 ; 1 Thess. v. 11 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 26.

The "peace" here, in distinction from that in v. 17, means chiefly fraternal peace. The life of the Christian is compared to a structure which is being erected : the structure is primarily God's work, but the brethren of the Christian can further or retard the building up thereof. Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 9, "Ye are God's structure !" The "building" of v. 19 is "God's work" of v. 20—the structure, that is, that God has built up in our brother Christian. This we must not destroy, or pull down (κατόλυσ), for the sake of eating a particular kind of food.

Some commentators take the "work of God" as the Christian community in general (rather than the individual Christian : so, Lietz., SH, etc.) : others explain it as the work of the Christian mission which God has instituted and sustains. Aquinas explains it as *opus gratiæ quod in nobis ipsis (Deus) specialiter operatur*.

It is true that all things, considered in themselves, are clean : yet a thing which in itself is clean may become evil—either to the weak, when they eat thereof against their conscience, or to the strong when by eating thereof they give scandal to others. Thus τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίοντι may refer either to the "strong," or to the "weak." In the former case the phrase means : "Who eats so as to cause offence !" in the latter : "Who eats so as to take offence !" Since the context deals mainly with the duties of the "strong" the phrase may be taken more naturally in the former sense.

The subject of κακόν is probably τὸ ἐσθίειν (i.e., τὰ καθάρα) : Gutjahr suggests as subject τὸ πάντα φαγεῖν.

21. This is a call to the "strong" not to insist on their freedom. The Vulgate, *Aut scandalizatur aut infirmatur*,¹ supports the reading ἡ σκανδαλίζεται ἡ ἀσθενεῖ, which appears in many codices (B X, etc. : also *Vet. Lat.*) : many critics regard the clause as an addition to the text made on the basis of 1 Cor. viii. 11-13.

After the second μηδέ something must be added—possibly ποιῆσαι ἄλλο τι.

The reference to wine-drinking has led to the inference that the "weak" at Rome abstained from wine as well as from meats.

¹ WW. read, *offendit aut scandalizatur aut infirmatur*.

The three verbs, προσκόπτει, σκανδαλίζεται, ἀσθενεῖ, may be a mere rhetorical piling up of words, intended to cover every kind of scandal-giving. Some commentators take σκανδαλίζεται as wider than προσκόπτει, and explain ἀσθενεῖ as = "is disturbed in conscience" (so Bard.). Aquinas explains *offenditur* as = *turbatur contra te quasi illicite agentem*—*per quod pax ejus perturbatur : scandalizatur* he takes as = *ad casum peccati provocatur, propter quod læditur ejus justitia : infirmatur*, he explains—*saltem in dubitationem venit utrum hoc quod agitur sit licitum, per quod ejus spirituale gaudium diminuitur*. Aquinas makes careful distinction in his commentary on the present context between *scandalum pusillorum* and *scandalum Phariseorum*: to prevent the former it may be necessary to abstain from all such things in themselves lawful, as are not required for salvation. There is no need to abstain from things that are *per se* lawful in order to prevent "Pharisaic" scandal (*i.e.*, the scandal which arises *ex malitia eorum qui scandalizantur*). Aquinas notes also that the *scandalum pusillorum* may pass over into the *scandalum Phariseorum*.

22. There are two well-supported readings :

(a) οὐ πίστιν ἦν ἔχεις, and (b) οὐ πίστιν ἔχεις :

(a) is accepted by SH and Lietzmann.

(b) could be taken as a question, as in the Vulgate.

It is possible that (b) is an intentional correction of (a), or that the diversity of reading has arisen from a confusion (due to pronunciation) between ἦν and the second syllable of πίστιν. The difference of reading makes no serious difference of sense. The interpretation of κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε, however, causes difficulty. Some commentators regard it as meaning that the "strong" Christian ought to keep his "faith" to himself, that he should keep his conviction to himself and not force it on the "weaker" brother ; he could thus be content with the testimony of his own conscience and avoid shocking the "weak." The Vulgate, *penes temetipsum habe*, supports this view.

Others take κατὰ σεαυτὸν as = "so far as you come in question," relate *ad te ipsum*—*i.e.*, when there is no fear of any scandal-giving. Gutjahr accepts this view as representing better the spirit of the Greek text (reading οὐ πίστιν ἔχεις as a question): he compares 1 Cor. x. 27-29. When the "strong" has a conviction he may act on it if there is no risk of scandal-giving.

In this verse πίστις is not faith in the dogmatic sense, but conviction of freedom, based on genuine grasp of the Faith.

The "makarism" is for the one who has firm convictions and acts on them without protest from his conscience: it is intended primarily for the "strong"; but it might conceivably also, in certain circumstances, apply to the "weak."

Ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτόν—he that does not judge himself is he that acts without hesitation and with confidence. There is a sort of play on words in the phrase: ὁ μὴ κρίνων would mean "he that does not make distinctions" as opposed to ὁ διακρινόμενος: with the addition of ἑαυτόν the sense becomes "he that does (need to) judge himself": he can carry out what he selects to do without hesitation, without any uneasy and uncertain self-analysis, without any lurking fear lest his attitude be wrong.

23. Δοκιμάζει means to select to do, to think it right to do.¹ The διακρινόμενος is the "weak" Christian, who, because of his scruples, is in doubt as to lawfulness or unlawfulness of a food. When such a one, in spite of his scruples, eats the food, κατακρίνεται—he has been already condemned by his conscience, and by God. "Condemnation" here does not necessarily imply grave sin, and there is no suggestion of eternal damnation.

In the phrase ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως we must understand ἔφαγεν, or something similar: πίστις here also means "conviction." Paul then states the general principle: Every action which does not proceed from conviction based on faith is sinful. This statement gives, of course, no basis for the doctrine of Bajus that every action of an unbeliever is sinful: that doctrine is opposed to the clear teaching of Paul (Cf. ii. 14 f.). Aquinas explains the present passage thus: *Omne quod est contra fidem vel contra conscientiam peccatum est, etsi ex genere suo bonum esse videatur: puta, si paganus ad honorem suorum deorum virginitatem servet, vel eleemosynam det, hoc ipso peccat.* After xiv. 23 there follows in certain MSS. the Doxology which is usually found at the end of the Epistle, xvi. 25-27. This arrangement is given by a few Uncial MSS., by many minuscules, and Lectionaries, and by the Greek commentators. The best MSS., however, and old versions like Vet. Lat. and Vulgate, put the Doxology at the end of chapter xvi. The close connection in thought between chapter xiv. and xv. 1-13 does not permit of the insertion of the Doxology at the end of chapter xiv. (See the Note on the Doxology at the end of this commentary).

¹ SH explains it as "approve after testing and examining." This meaning does not, perhaps, fit in well with ὁ μὴ κρίνων.

(c) *Be considerate and tolerant towards all.* XV, 1-13

Here the advice to the faithful takes a more general character: it is no longer concerned exclusively with the contrasts between the "weak" and the "strong." Paul turns at first to the "strong," among whom he puts himself, but his exhortation to mutual toleration and consideration holds for all. The glory of God should be the end and aim of all Christian endeavour.

1. We, the strong: this is the first time that Paul names the "strong": it is reasonable that the "strong" should be mentioned here so prominently, for it naturally falls to the "strong" to be a stay and support to the "weak":¹ ὀφείλομεν—"it is a duty for us" (Cf. 1 Cor. v. 10; x. 10; xi. 7, 10; 2 Cor. xii. 14). Ἀσθενήματα (a *hapax legomenon*)—the weaknesses of the ἁδύνατοι are a burden to be borne by the strong. Cf. Gal. vi. 2: "Bear ye the burdens of one another"—where βαστάζειν is also used instead of the classical φέρειν.

The "strong" are also under an obligation not to aim at pleasing themselves (cf. 1 Cor. x. 33)—a warning against the selfishness which leads to disunion and disruption.

2. Instead of aiming at our own satisfaction we must seek to please our neighbour—but to please him so as to build him up spiritually: in pleasing our neighbour we try to secure his advantage (εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν),—his spiritual profit (xiv. 16): that advantage is more definitely defined as πρὸς οἰκοδομήν: the neighbour is to receive a good impression from us so that he may be spiritually encouraged and stimulated: the ἀγαθόν is the immediate, and the οἰκοδομή is the remote end. The precept in v. 2 is meant for both the strong and the weak. In Gal. i. 10 Paul sets aside with contempt the policy of pleasing men; in 1 Cor. ix. 20-23 he accepts that policy as the guiding principle of his missionary work. Here the apparent inconsistency is removed by the εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν and πρὸς οἰκοδομήν: it is right to seek to please others for their spiritual good. Fraternal charity, not self-seeking, must be the inspiration of Christian conduct.

3. The duty of helping the neighbour is based on the example of Christ.

As in Phil. ii. 5-11 Christ is set up as the model of obedience, so He is here put forward as the model of that self-sacrificing charity which Paul demands of the Romans. Christ took on Himself the revilings and persecutions of His enemies—

¹ Δυνατός does not, of course, mean rich or powerful, but strong, as opposed to those who are "weak in faith."

who were also the enemies of God : He sought not His own honour, joy, or advantage (Phil. ii. 6). We should, therefore, endure patiently the weaknesses and reproaches of others, and relinquish a measure of our freedom, if the spiritual needs of our brethren demand such a sacrifice.

Psalm lxviii is quoted also above in xi. 9 f. The suffering Just Man of the Psalm is a type of Our Lord, and the Psalm is frequently quoted as a Messianic Psalm in the New Testament (*Cf.*, in addition to the texts in "Romans," John xv. 25 ; ii. 17 ; Matth. xxvii. 34, 48 ; Acts i. 20 : *cf.* also Phil. iv. 3).

If Paul had in view here the first half of the verse (v. 10) that he quotes :

"For zeal for Thy House devours me,"

the general sense would be, that, because of Christ's burning zeal for the service and honour of His Father, the insults of those who insulted God wounded Christ with special intensity.

As the verse thus understood would not help Paul's reasoning in the present context, he simply takes the second half of the Psalm verse, and uses it as if it stood alone.

4. Justifying his use of Ps. lxviii. 10, Paul insists that everything in the Sacred Scriptures, and particularly everything referring to Christ and His sufferings, is for our instruction (*Cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 16 ; 1 Cor. ix. 9-10 ; x. 11 ; *cf.* also Rom. iv. 23-24).

"Ὅσα προεγράφη is not to be limited to Messianic prophecies : it includes the entire Old Testament. The purpose of the Old Testament writings is, then, to instruct the faithful of the New Dispensation (ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν).

The ἵνα clauses indicates the purpose for which God provided the instruction contained in the Scriptures—that, namely, the Christian hope of salvation might be confirmed by the Scripture message of patience and consolation : τῶν γραφῶν is to be taken (as genitive of possession) with both ὑπομονή and παράκλησις : the Scriptures teach the value of patient endurance and they show forth also the steady and victorious development of the Kingdom of God.

"The Hope" is the specific Christian hope of glory ; ἔχωμεν may mean either, "that we may possess," or "that we may hold fast to."

5. God is called "the God of patience and consolation" because of v. 4 : it is from God that patience and consolation come. There is no good reason for holding that verses 4 and 5 refer exclusively, or even specially, to the strong. The Scriptures were written for the instruction of all, and

all—both strong and weak—need patience and consolation and confident hope. All must pray that God may give them τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν—to live at peace with one another united in the Christian Hope. Here there is no longer question of the problems of the “strong” and the “weak,” but of the need of peace and harmony in the community generally.

In τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν is implied the complete unity of thought and action in the community in all ethical and religious matters (*Cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 11 ; Phil. ii. 2). The norm and standard of that unity is Jesus Christ : it must be according to His will, and the members of the community attain it by taking Christ as their model (Phil. ii.).

6. According to some commentators this verse indicates the highest end that can be secured by the harmony of the faithful—the absolutely unanimous praise of God, the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Others take the unanimous praise of God as that which is willed by Christ (κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν), *i.e.*, the community will be of one mind according to Christ Jesus, when it unites with one heart and mouth in the praise of God.

It is possible to make τοῦ κυρίου to depend both on θεόν and πατέρα, (“praise the God and Father of Our Lord”), or on πατέρα alone (“praise God, the Father of Our Lord”) : the former is the more natural way of understanding the clause (*Cf.* Eph. i. 17 : “the God of Our Lord Jesus Christ”). “God is the God of Christ as having created His humanity. and His Father as having begotten Him” (Lagrange). There may be a creed-echo in this verse.

7. Paul goes on to emphasise still further the duty of mutual toleration and support. Christ was of Jewish descent, and yet brought the message and means of salvation to all. Imitating Him all Christians, whatever their origin, whether converts from Judaism or Heathenism, should help one another.

Προσλαμβάνεσθε is used in the same sense as in xiv. 1 : the same reason is given for the exhortation as in xiv. 3 (ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτὸν προσελάβετο)—“Christ (used here as the equivalent of God in xiv. 3) has received you into the Christian community.” The reading ὑμᾶς (Vogels : Merk.) is better supported than ἡμᾶς (Nestle). *Cf.* the Vulgate. *suscepit vos.*

The διό implies that mutual help is necessary if the unanimous praise of God, described in *v.* 6, is to be attained. Christians in general, without exception, should help each other as brothers, for Christ has taken them all into His

Church. The mutual help, to which Paul exhorts, is not to be limited to the sphere of differences between the "strong" and the "weak": it must be given in everything that concerns religion. Differences of race, and education are to be discounted—for all have been taken by Christ into His Church on terms of equality as His brethren.

Εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ should be read with προσελάβετο, not with προσλαμβάνεσθε. In taking the different races and types into His Church Christ seeks the glory of God.

8. Paul explains how the calling of both Jews and Gentiles procures the glory of God.

In becoming the "servant of circumcision," that is, in devoting Himself to the salvation of the Jews, Christ procured the glory of God by showing the loyalty of God in the fulfilment of the promises which He had made to the Patriarchs.

On the other hand, since the Gentiles had no promises to rely upon, the call which Christ has given them is a proof of the immense mercy of God, and, therefore, redounds to His glory.

The general sense is, then, that, whereas in the reception of the Jews into the Church, God's veracity and His loyalty to His promises are manifested, the reception of the heathen into the Church is a striking proof of His mercy. But all that manifests the fidelity and mercy of God serves also unto His glory.

The reasoning of St. Paul does not suggest that the Jews, as contrasted with the Gentiles, had a *right* to reception into the Church. The promises which God had made to the Patriarchs were acts of pure graciousness (iv. 16; ix. 15). If Paul were not here making a distinction between Jews and heathens in regard to their call, he could easily show that the call of the Gentiles was frequently foretold in the Old Testament, and that, therefore, their actual reception into the Church was as much a proof of Divine veracity and loyalty as the call of the Jews. The calling of each and all is ultimately due to the pure graciousness of God.

9. The gratitude of the heathen for the divine mercy shown in their calling is often foreshadowed in the Old Testament. They are often summoned to join with the Jews in the praise of God.

The first passage quoted is Ps. xvii. 50 (= 2 Kings xxii. 50). David thanks the Lord for having made subject to His Anointed the heathen peoples, and promises the Lord that in thanksgiving he will praise Him among (and, therefore, with) the Gentiles. Paul takes David as the type of the Messiah, and regards David's words as a declaration that

Christ will establish Himself as King among the heathens, and along with them will praise God (*Cf.* xiv. 11). The reception of the Gentiles into the Church is the fulfilment of this prophecy.

10. The second passage is taken from the Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 43—according to the LXX).¹ Moses summons the heathen peoples to join with Israel, the people of God, in chanting the praise of God.

For εὐφράνθητε *cf.* Gal. iv. 27. The nominative to λέγει (if it is not impersonally used) is ἡ γὰρφή. The Hebrew text is, apparently, a summons to the heathen to sing the good fortune of Israel—but the LXX implies a Hebrew original of which the Masoretic text may be a scribal corruption.

11. The third Old Testament quotation is from Ps. cxvi. 1: here the universality of salvation is clearly expressed. The ἔθνη and λαοί here have usually been taken as the Gentile peoples alone, but it is possible that Paul regards them as including the Jews also; so that the Psalm would be an invitation to the whole world to join in the praise of God.

- 12-13. The fourth Old Testament text is from Isaias xi. 10. As the preceding texts speak of the Gentiles as turning to Yahweh in thanksgiving, joy, and praise, respectively, so this fourth text represents them as turning to the Lord in hope. Paul quotes according to LXX (omitting ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ after ἔσται). The ῥίζα, the *shoresh Yishai* (= the root of Jesse) is the same as the Branch from the roots of Jesse (Is. xi. 1), *i.e.*, Christ, the Messiah-King. Jesse (= *Yishai*) was the father of David, and the Branch from the roots of Jesse is of Davidic stock (*Cf.* Is. liii. 2; Apoc. v. 5; xxii. 16). The "root" of Jesse is emphasised because at the time of Christ's birth the House of David had sunk into obscurity and poverty.

Καί is explanatory—"He, that is, that will arise" (the present participle with future sense): ἀνιστάμενος is regarded by some commentators as including a reference to the death and Resurrection of Christ (*Cf.* Is. xlii. 4 (LXX) and Matth. xii. 21). The concluding words of the Isaian text in v. 12 suggest the wish here expressed: May God, the source of all true hope, grant to them abounding hope as an effect of the outpouring of His Holy Spirit! (*Cf.* Acts i. 8). With hope go joy and peace—as Paul showed above in Chapter V. Faith which is accompanied by joy and peace has, as its fruit, confident and abounding hope. That all three gifts are rooted in faith is expressed by ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν; that all

¹ Aquinas derives this text from Is. lxvi. 19.

three are dispensed by the Holy Spirit is indicated by ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου. The Vulgate, *et virtute*, should be *in virtute*. Peace with God begets Joy, and with that Peace and Joy as its pinions, Hope wings its way heavenwards.

This prayerful wish marks the end of the exhortative section. From the explanation given above of the connection in thought between xv. 1-13 and the final section of chapter xiv, it ought to be clear that xv. 1-13 forms a smooth and natural conclusion of the discussion which began in xiv. 1.¹

EPILOGUE. XV, 14-XVI, 27

Paul in this concluding section explains again his reasons for writing the letter, and justifies the authoritative tone which he has at times adopted (xv. 14-16). He then looks back for a moment over the development of his missionary work, showing how his policy always has been to preach the Gospel where it was still unknown, and that, therefore, his purposed visit to Rome would be no more than a passing visit to that Church on his way to fields still untilled (xv. 17-21). He next proceeds to outline his plans for the immediate future—his journeys to Jerusalem, and through Rome to Spain—and begs the prayers of the faithful at Rome for the successful execution of his programme (xv. 22-33). There follows a word of recommendation for Phoebe—the woman who, probably, was to bring the letter to Rome (xvi. 1-2); and then there is a long list of greetings to Roman Christians (xvi. 3-16), followed by warnings against teachers of false doctrines (xvi. 17-20). Greetings from Paul's companions to the Roman Church are added (xvi. 21-23), and the letter ends with a solemn Doxology (xvi. 25-27).

¹ It has been argued that xv. 8-13 does not follow naturally on xv. 1-6, that xv. 7 is the interpolation of an editor, and that xv. 8 is really the continuation of xi. 36. This is the view of Spitta, who regards the section xii-xv. 6, together with xvi. 1-20, as forming a separate second letter to the Romans which has been inserted in the first. See *Studien und Kritiken* (1913), 109. For other hypotheses on this matter see Holtzmann, *Einleitung* (3rd ed.), 242 ff. See the full discussion of the problems connected with chapters xv and xvi in the Essay of Rudolf Schumacher, *Die beiden letzten Kapitel des Römerbriefes* (*Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, xiv. Band. 4. Heft.). Münster, 1929.

Since the publication of Schumacher's work the radical critic Barnikol, in his *Forschungen zur Entstehung des Urchristentums des Neuen Testaments und der Kirche*, has put forward novel views about chapter xv in the Essay, *Römer xv. Letzte Reiseziele des Paulus*. Kiel, 1931. He tries to show that xv. 22-23 is a fragment of a letter written by Paul from Corinth to Antioch, in which Paul intimates to his friends in Antioch that he is about to make a journey to Jerusalem, and that from Jerusalem he will travel to Antioch, and thence to Rome. See below on vv. 23-24. Barnikol's argumentation is arbitrary and somewhat fantastic.

(1) *Paul has written "daringly" as Apostle of the Gentiles.*
XV, 14-16

14. Paul is satisfied that the Romans are so well disposed and so well instructed that they really need no exhortation from outside. At the beginning of the letter he had spoken of the world-wide recognition of their faith, and of his own desire to benefit spiritually by intercourse with them (i. 8, 12). Hence verse 14 is not merely a product of diplomatic politeness written to secure a kindly reception for the letter and for Paul himself. It expresses Paul's genuine opinion; but, of course, it was good missionary policy to express appreciation of the excellent condition of an important Church which the Apostle was about to visit. But if the condition of the Church at Rome was so good, why has Paul written at such length both on speculative and practical matters? This question Paul answers in the following verses (15-16).

Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ—"I, for my part"—however otherwise it might appear from the letter: though he has written so emphatically, he is fully "convinced" (cf. viii. 38) of the splendid condition of the Church at Rome.

Καὶ αὐτοὶ = ye, yourselves—without help from me, or other outsiders. The "goodness" here spoken of is good will (not merely "love" as the Vulgate has it). The Romans have also full knowledge of Christian truth. That the Romans have a full grasp of Christian fundamentals Paul has taken for granted in the letter (Cf. vi. 15 ff., etc.). With this reference to complete knowledge cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 2.

15. Though instruction and exhortation might, therefore, seem superfluous, Paul has written to the Romans "to a certain degree" *τολμηροτέρως* (Nestle) (or, *τολμηρότερον*)—rather daringly (or, "very daringly"). The "rather daringly" refers to the authoritative tone of the letter: *ἀπὸ μέρους* does not mean here "in places" (as SH and others hold), for Paul is referring to the letter as a whole, but, "to a certain degree," it tones down the sense of *τολμηροτέρως*.

In thus writing it has not been Paul's intention to teach the Romans anything hitherto unknown to them, but only to refresh their memory (*ἐπαναμνήσκων ὑμᾶς*) in regard to what they already had learned. This he has done *διὰ τὴν χάριν*—because of the grace, or, in view of the grace (i.e., the grace of the Heathen Apostolate) which he has received from God.

16. Here he states the purpose of his Apostolic ministry.

According to God's design Paul has to do priestly service for Christ (—to be a λειτουργός Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ) in regard to the Gentiles (εἰς τὰ ἔθνη), and that priestly service is concerned with the preaching of the Gospel so as to bring the Gentiles to the acceptance of the Faith and the worship of God. The Gentiles thus brought to the Faith and to the true worship of God would become an offering (προσφορά) unto God which, as sanctified by the Holy Spirit would be well-pleasing to God (WW. read *accepta sanctificata*, omitting *et*).

As Apostle of the heathens it is Paul's office to present the heathens as a holy and well-pleasing offering to God (and this, of course, he would have to do with the Romans as with other Gentiles). Presenting the converted heathens to God would be a priestly service (ιερουργεῖν), and that priestly service is ultimately performed through the preaching of the Gospel. Hence Paul can say ιερουργεῖν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ—"dealing in priestly fashion with the Gospel of God"—using the Gospel as a means of priestly ministration.

In the Old Testament λειτουργός is sometimes used in the sense of "priest" (cf. Nehem. x. 37), but generally it is used of the Levites, as distinct from the priests. In Heb. viii. 2 it is used as = priests (cf. above, xiii. 6; Phil. ii. 17), and in the present verse it appears clearly to have that meaning. The context gives no real support to the view that Paul, according to this verse, is merely an "assistant" of the High Priest, Jesus, who prepares the sacrifice which Christ, then, offers to God. It is Paul who makes to God the offering which, as divinely commissioned Apostle, he has prepared—the converted Gentiles, who are baptised and equipped with the graces of the Holy Spirit.

The Vulgate, *sanctificans Evangelium Dei* is an inadequate rendering of the Greek. It is not the *Gospel* that Paul offers in Sacrifice: the Gospel is the means he employs to prepare the offering, and ιερουργεῖν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον can only mean, "perform priestly service by means of the Gospel." Theophlact. explains: Αὕτη μοι ιερωσύνη τὸ καταγγέλειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Μάχαιραν ἔχω τὸν λόγον (as in Eph. vi. 17). Θυσία ἐστὲ ὑμεῖς.

The sending of this letter to the Romans is, then, a phase of that priestly activity by which the Gentiles are made ready to be offered as a well-pleasing Sacrifice to God. Even if the Romans have already been prepared by others as a holy offering to God, they can be made more pleasing still, as a sacrificial offering, in God's sight.

(2) *Paul can boast of great success in Christ.* XV, 17-21

17. As an Apostle Paul has a right to boast with God (τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν—in adverbial sense), but only “in Christ Jesus” (i.e., in union with Christ Jesus: not Paul has done the work, but Christ through Paul).

Καύχησις means here actual boasting; he had legitimate ground for boasting of the successful work which he has accomplished in the Lord.

Τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν is usually explained as indicating the sphere to which the “boasting” refers—in *his rebus quæ ad Deum pertinent, puta in rebus salutis* (à Lapide). The Vulgate gives a better sense with its *ad Deum*. The expression τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν occurs again in Heb. ii. 17 (Vulgate, *ad Deum*) and in Heb. v. 1—where the Vulgate has, *in his quæ sunt ad Deum*. In the present verse there is little need to have a clause describing Paul’s Apostolic activity as “religious”—it is so obviously that: hence the rendering *ad Deum* is here correct.

The article is not found with καύχησις in all the MSS., and as no boasting has been mentioned in the preceding sections the presence of the article is slightly difficult to explain. Possibly, however, for that reason, it may be taken as having stood in the primitive text: copyists would follow the easier path of omitting the article. With the article the sense is “I have *this* boast” (i.e., that of having offered the heathen as a Sacrifice to God); but he has it only in Christ Jesus.

For other allusions to Paul’s successful work as Apostle, see Gal. ii. 7-9; 1 Cor. ix. 2; xv. 10, etc.

- 18-19. There we get a further idea of the apostolic achievements of which Paul might boast.

He is particular to emphasise that he does not boast of himself, or of anything he himself has done: he will boast only of what Christ has wrought through him for the heathen mission. The somewhat confused form of expression in v. 18 arises, perhaps, from an attempt to express at once two thoughts: (1) I cannot talk of anything which is not Christ’s work; (2) I would not venture to speak of this if it were not Christ’s work (so Lietzmann). Lagrange analyses thus: “I will speak only of indisputable facts—words and works which prove that I have fulfilled the mission I received to bring the heathen to faith and obedience; and I would not speak of this at all, if it were not, properly speaking, the work of Christ.”¹

¹ By omitting the two negatives we get the meaning well: “For I shall dare to speak only of what Christ has wrought through me.”

Τολμήσω contains, according to SH, a touch of irony; Lagrange excludes the irony (for which, indeed, there is no place), and explains the form as more "reserved" than the present (Cf. 2 Cor. x. 12). The Vulgate, has *audeo*. "Speak" here is practically the same as "boast."

Paul's work is directed εἰς ὑπακοήν ἐθνῶν—to the conversion (obedient acceptance of the faith) of the heathen (cf. i. 5): but all his Apostolic work Christ has wrought (κατεργάσατο) through Paul. Paul preached and undertook great enterprises (λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ); he performed miracles (ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων), and manifestations of the Holy Spirit were shown in him, and in those who accepted his preaching: but all these things Christ really wrought through Paul (Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 4-5).

The same miracles may be called "signs" or "wonders" according as we regard their capacity to convey a meaning or to arouse astonishment (Cf. 2 Cor. xii. 12; Matth. xxiv. 24; John iv. 48; Acts ii. 22, 43, etc.). For miracles wrought by St. Paul, see Acts xiv. 3; xv. 12; xvi. 16 ff.; xix. 11 f.; xx. 10. Paul uses δύνάμις here both of the power of working miracles, and of the charismatic phenomena which accompanied his preaching (cf. the note on i. 4): these charismatic phenomena are probably of the kind described in 1 Cor. xii.

In B πνεύματος stands without ἁγίου (Vulgate, *Spiritus Sancti*), and this is probably the original reading; some MSS. added θεοῦ, others ἁγίου—apparently to complete what seemed to be "an unfinished expression" (SH). Vogels and Merk read θεοῦ.

The Vulgate *efficit* ought to be *effecit*.

Christ wrought so powerfully through Paul that (ὥστε—expresses result) he accomplished his Apostolic task in a huge circle, or sweep, from Jerusalem in the south-east to Illyricum in the north-west.

Καὶ κύκλῳ does not mean "in the vicinity of Jerusalem round about"; it refers to the sphere of his great missionary tours—including the many journeyings to and fro and across therein—which extended from the Holy City to Illyricum or its borders.¹ Paul writes, of course, from the point of view of his second visit to Corinth, during which this letter was written. Illyricum was the country north of Macedonia, which included the Roman Provinces of Dalmatia and Moesia. Though Paul had spent but little time as a Christian in Jerusalem, he had on occasion preached there (cf. Acts

¹ The clause might be rendered: "Beginning with Jerusalem and making a huge circle as far as Illyricum."

ix. 26-30 ; Gal. i. 18 f. ; Acts xviii. 22 ; xxvi. 20) ; he could, however, scarcely claim to have preached to heathens in Jerusalem, and if it is not necessary to admit that he preached, in the sense of the present context in Jerusalem, neither are we bound to hold that he actually published the Gospel in Illyricum : the phrase μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ could mean " up to the borders of Illyricum."

It is, however, possible that Paul paid a brief missionary visit to Illyricum from Corinth (on second missionary tour—to be put after Acts xviii. 17). A visit to Illyricum during the third missionary journey, when Paul was traversing Macedonia (Acts xx. 2), is, perhaps, more easily thinkable.¹ Lietzmann thinks it not impossible that Paul visited Illyricum from Thessalonica (Acts xvii).

But since, as has been said, there is no proof that Paul preached as Apostle of the Gentiles in Jerusalem, so neither is it necessary to find a place in Paul's missionary career for a visit to Illyricum. He had toured as Apostle all the countries lying between Jerusalem and Illyricum—Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, the segment of a great geographical circle to which ἐν κύκλῳ refers.

In all these countries Paul had " fulfilled " (πεπληρωκέναι)—that is, fully preached the Gospel. Paul has here in view, of course, lands and provinces, rather than districts and individuals. He had preached and founded Churches in many of the chief centres—the " Key Cities "—of Asia Minor and Macedonia, and he had done extensive work as a Missionary to the Gentiles in Syria. If Christ's name had been published in any important centre of a province, it could be spoken of as known throughout the province (cf. 1 Thess. i. 8 ; 1 Cor. i. 2). It may, of course, be freely admitted that the use of the word πεπληρωκέναι is somewhat rhetorical.

20. There are two readings : (a) φιλοτιμούμενον, and (b) φιλοτιμοῦμαι. If we accept (a) it must be regarded as dependent on ὥστε με πεπληρωκέναι. Cornely accepts (b), and regards δέ as explanatory (= *nimirum*).

In places within the huge area that he has mentioned, where Churches had been founded, or considerable missionary activities had been carried out before Paul's arrival, the Apostle of the Gentiles did not consider it necessary, or even appropriate, to preach the Gospel officially as Apostle of the Gentiles. It was " a point of honour " with him (for φιλοτιμούμενον cf. 1 Thess. iv. 11 ; 2 Cor. v. 9) to confine his

¹ Cf. Zahn, *Einleitung*. i. 296. 3rd ed.

Apostolic work to districts where Christ had hitherto not been known. He would not willingly build on foundations laid by others, while there were still great areas where Christ had not been preached. He would not willingly take credit for work that others had done, and besides, he preferred the most strenuous type of Apostolic activity. But most of all was he unwilling to build on other's foundations, because he regarded it as his special mission to lay foundations for others to build on (*Cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 10 ; ix. 2). That he sometimes did preach where others had already preached (at Damascus, for instance), or wrote to instruct Churches which he had not directly established (Colossæ), does not imply a real contradiction of the principle here laid down—that he would not carry on fundamental Apostolic work in a district where other preachers had already been successfully active. At Damascus, as at Jerusalem, he probably preached only to Jewish audiences, and Colossæ was founded probably by one of Paul's disciples, commissioned possibly as a preacher by Paul himself.

21. The Isaian passage (Is. lii. 15, according to LXX) is a statement of the principle laid down by Paul that only virgin soil is to be tilled.

Περὶ αὐτοῦ is an enlargement of the Masoretic text : the αὐτοῦ refers to the " Servant of Yahweh."

For συνήσουσιν (future of συνίημι) *cf.* Matth. xiii. 23, 51.

The " seeing " (ὄψονται) is spiritual seeing.

But Rome had already a flourishing Church. Why then does Paul write to it as Apostle of the Gentiles, and wish to visit it, and preach there ? (i. 10-15). Paul suggests the answer when he implies that his visit to Rome will be merely a stage on his journey to Spain (xv. 23, 28). He could also well point out that Rome, after all, was the centre of the world, and that the Apostle of the Gentiles might well treat it differently from other centres ; his mission to the Gentiles could scarcely be regarded as fully accomplished if he had not somehow exercised his Apostolate at Rome. We have already seen in the first chapter of the Epistle, and again at the beginning of the present chapter, how delicately careful Paul is to exclude all possibility of having his letter to the Romans, or his visit to their Church, mistakenly interpreted.

From the Acts (xxviii. 30-31) and from the Epistles of the Captivity (Phil. i. 12 f.) we know that Paul did actually carry on Apostolic activity in Rome. But such missionary work as a prisoner might do could not reasonably be regarded as opposed to the spirit of the policy which is here outlined.

(3) *Paul's immediate Missionary Programme.* XV, 22-33

22. Opportunities for visiting Rome had often presented themselves to Paul, but whenever any such opportunity arose it had always hitherto been countered by a serious obstacle.

Διό—because he still had work to do in the East. He did not feel free to visit a flourishing Church not founded by himself while there were still Churches to be established elsewhere.

Τὰ πολλά = πολλάκις (i. 13), or, perhaps, as the Vulgate has it, *plurimum*. The Vulgate adds here from i. 13, *Et prohibitus sum usque adhuc*. In some MSS. πολλάκις has here been substituted for τὰ πολλά—from i. 13. Whenever Paul found a new district where Christ was unknown, he was once more prevented from visiting Rome: ἐνεκοιττόμην implies that he had been constantly prevented.

23. There is now no longer any district left in the eastern world (ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις) to be evangelised, and as soon, therefore, as Paul has completed his mission at Jerusalem, he will be free to satisfy his longing to visit Rome (Acts xix. 21). He will take in Rome on his way to Spain, and Spain he will visit as a country where Christ is not yet known.

- 23-24. Verses 23-24 are anacoluthic in structure. The apodosis to these verses is not given really until v. 28. Various suggestions for overcoming the anacolouthon have been made. For instance, it has been proposed to read ἔχω for the second ἔχων, or to put ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς after Σπανίαν; it has also been proposed to omit γάρ after ἐλπίζω, and to attach ὥς ἄν to ἐλπίζω (so Cornely).

The confused construction seems to be due to Paul's wish to explain why he will not visit Rome immediately; he will come to Rome, but he must first go to Jerusalem with the alms that had been collected for the Christians of the Holy City.

ὥς ἄν = *quandocumque, simulatque* (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 34; Phil. ii. 23): it has a temporal sense; the ἄν introduces an aspect of uncertainty both in reference to the event and its date.

Σπανία is the Pyrennean Peninsula—then a Roman province. The older Greek name of the country was Ἰβηρία, and the Romans called it Ἰσπανία (1 Macch. viii. 3). It is likely that Paul had been thinking of a missionary tour to the extreme West for a good while (Cf. 2 Cor. x. 15, 16).

Early tradition makes Paul visit Spain after the first Roman imprisonment.¹

Διαπορευόμενος—on his way through to the West (for the word cf. Luke xiii. 22; Acts xvi. 4). The Vulgate has *præteriens* instead of *transiens*. Paul makes it clear that his visit to Rome is not for the purpose of ordinary Apostolic preaching (Cf. i. 13).

Προπεμφθῆναι—to have himself escorted forth by members of the Roman Community (Cf. Acts xx. 38; 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 11; 2 Cor. i. 16; 3 John 6). Estius remarks on *deducar*: *Est honoris causa deducere et prosequi abeuntem, subministratis etiam, si fit opus, rebus ad iter agendum necessariis*. Paul hopes that the Romans will speed him on his way to Spain.

Ἐκεῖ = ἐκεῖσε (Cf. Matth. ii. 22; John xi. 8).

Ἐὰν ὑμῶν πρῶτον ἀπὸ μέρους ἐμπλησθῶ is an emphatic indication of Paul's longing to meet the Romans. He will enjoy his meeting with them as far as a mere passing visit permits (ἀπὸ μέρους): even from a short visit he anticipates great pleasure. There is no hint here of the route which Paul intended to take to Spain. The older authorities suggest a journey by land with missionary work on the way in Northern Italy and Southern Gaul.

25-26. Paul's immediate duty is to bring to Jerusalem the alms

¹ Evidence that St. Paul carried out his plan of visiting Spain is found in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians (*Ad. Cor.* 5, 6 f.), written in the last decade of the first century. Clement says that Paul journeyed ἐπὶ τὸ τέμα τῆς δύσεως, and it has been shown (especially by E. Dubowy in his work *Klemens von Rom über die Reise Pauli nach Spanien. Biblische Studien*, xix. 3. 1914) that the τέμα τῆς δύσεως for Clement means Spain. The Pauline journey to Spain is also mentioned by the Muratorian Fragment when it explains (35-39) why St. Luke has not spoken of that journey in Acts. It is certain, therefore, that the early Church in Rome accepted the Pauline journey to Spain as a fact. Clement's Letter was written less than thirty years after Paul's death as the formal message of a Church in which Paul had been active, in one way or another, for several years, and many members of which must still have retained vivid personal recollections of Paul at the time when Clement wrote to the Corinthian Church. It is unreasonable, therefore, to try to explain away (as many critics do) Clement's reference to the Spanish Journey of Paul as a mere inference from Rom. xv. 24. To suppose with Barnikol (*Römer xv. Letzte Reiseziele des Paulus. Jerusalem, Rom und Antiochien*. Kiel, 1931, p. 15 ff.) that "Spain" in xv. 24 is a scribal falsification for "Jerusalem," and that the "Spain" in xv. 28 ought to be "Italy," is to imply that the journey of St. Paul to Spain is the deliberate invention of some ancient scribe or ecclesiastic. It is obvious that the alleged falsification of the primitive text could not be the work of the Roman Church—for why should a Roman represent Paul as treating Rome merely as a stage on a missionary journey to the West? Barnikol's methods of "criticism" are, of course, subjective, and if adopted widely in the New Testament would lead to hopeless confusion. For a sane treatment by a liberal critic of the Spanish Journey of St. Paul see Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom*. 2nd. ed. Berlin and Leipzig, 1927, 242 ff. The Pastoral Epistles postulate a period of missionary activity of St. Paul in various districts of the East after his release from the first Roman imprisonment, but they do not give us sufficient data to decide whether the journey to Spain preceded the Apostle's work in the East, or followed it.

collected by the faithful of Macedonia and Achaia for the "Saints" (the Christians) in Jerusalem.¹

The present participle διακονῶν seems to suggest that the journey to Jerusalem is itself part of the "ministration" to the Saints—so that the Vulgate, *ministrare*, is not quite exact.

The collection for the "Saints"² had been agreed upon between Paul and the "Pillars" of the Church at the visit to Jerusalem described in Gal. ii. Paul had zealously carried out the work of collecting in the Churches of Macedonia and Achaia, and he is now about to set out for Jerusalem to bring to the "Saints" the offerings of the Churches. Representatives of the Churches that had contributed to the Collection are to accompany him to Jerusalem (*Cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 2 f. ; Acts xxiv. 17 ; 2 Cor. viii-ix). It is certain, therefore, that the letter to the Romans was written shortly before Paul left Corinth for Jerusalem in the last stage of the third great Missionary Tour.

Ἡὐδόκησεν expresses the freedom and readiness of their decision. Κοινωνία means "participation," "fellowship"—and then any token of Christian brotherhood, such as alms, etc. : the vagueness of τινά shows that Paul does not wish to give details about the offerings.

"The poor of the Saints" are not "the poor Saints," but "the poor among the Saints." Very many of the faithful at Jerusalem were poor—partly as a result of voluntary surrender of property, and partly through persecution (See Acts iv. 34 ; viii. 1 ; Heb. x. 34).

27. The repetition of ἡὐδόκησεν emphasises still more the generosity of the Greek Churches. But, after all, it was only right that they should help the Mother Church to which

¹ "Saints" as designation of Christians is frequent in the New Testament : it is based on Old Testament usage. Israel, as the Chosen People of God, was holy (Lev. xi. 44). In the Prophetic and post-prophetic books the more pious of the people are often called "the Saints" (Is. iv. 3 ; lxii. 12 ; Ps. xv. 3 ; xxxiii. 10). Daniel (vii. 18, 29, etc.) speaks of the ἅγιοι Ὑψίστου, and of οἱ ἅγιοι τοῦ Ὑψίστου (vii. 25). In the Psalms of Solomon the loyal Messianic community is called "a Holy People" (xvii. 28), and in the Odes of Solomon we hear also of "the Saints" (xvii. 19 ; xxii. 12, etc.). The epithet connotes close connection with God, and, perhaps, it had primitively the sense, "the holy ones of God." An attempt has been made to show that for St. Paul the "Saints" are exclusively, or almost exclusively, the Christians of Jerusalem (so Holl, *Der Osten*, Tübingen, 1928, p. 60), but this view has not been widely accepted. The origins and implications of the title "the Saints" are discussed at length in Lietzmann's Commentary, in Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, v., 380 f., and in the long article on ἅγιος and associated terms by Proksch and Kuhn in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Stuttgart. 1932.

² Galatia (1 Cor. xvi. 1) and the Province of Asia (Acts xx. 4), though not mentioned here, also joined in sending offerings to the "Saints."

they were indebted for so many supernatural blessings.¹ Some commentators have seen here a gentle hint to the Romans that they also should be generous towards the "Saints." The "fleshly things" are the things needful for bodily life (1 Cor. ix. 11).

In using *λειτουργῆσαι* for charitable ministration to the poor Paul insinuates that such service is, in a sense, an act of divine worship. Compare Paul's language in 2 Cor. ix. 12 ff.

28. As soon as Paul has accomplished the purpose of his mission to Jerusalem, and "put his seal on" the offerings of the Greek Churches (the "fruit" = the offerings, for they were the fruit produced by the feeling of gratitude towards, and the consciousness of unity with, the Mother Church), he will set out for Spain, taking Rome on the way.

"Putting his seal" on the offerings has been variously explained. Some commentators think that it means making certain of their safe delivery to the poor in Jerusalem. This is partly what Chrysostom has in view when he explains: *ὡς εἰς βασιλικά ταμεία ἐναποθέμενος, ὡς ἐν ἀσύλῳ καὶ ἀσφαλεῖ χωρίῳ*—so that they will be handed over intact. Others think that the sense is that Paul definitely authenticates the offerings brought by him as the gift of the Greek Churches.

While the precise meaning of the sealing must remain obscure, it is probably best to regard it as implying both the safe handing over of the offerings to those for whom they were intended, and the completion of Paul's task in regard to the collections.² It is possible, too, that Paul is thinking of the offerings as a seal set on the unity of the Aramaic Mother Church and the Church of the Gentile Converts.

29. Paul is certain that when he visits Rome he will come with "the fulness of Christ's blessing"—with abundance of spiritual gifts which will strengthen the Romans in the practice of the Christian virtues (Cf. i. 11). The "blessing of Christ" is the blessing that Christ imparts. The Vulgate, *in abundantia benedictionis Evangelii Christi*, evidently contains a gloss.³ There seems to be no justification for interpreting *εὐλογία* with Theophylact as a collection which Paul hopes to make in Rome.

30. While Paul is sure of finding rich consolation at Rome,

¹ In explaining the spiritual blessings in question Chrysostom says: "Of the Jews is Christ (John iv. 22): from them are the Apostles and prophets and all good things. And in these all the world has shared" (Cf. Rom. xi. 26).

² See Article on *σφραγίζεσθαι* by Rademacher in ZNW, 1933, p. 87 ff. R. thinks that *σφ. τιμῇ τι* is a technical business expression, emphasising one aspect of a familiar business transaction. The expression may have been a provincialism.

³ WW. omit *Evangelii*.

he does not know how things will go with him at Jerusalem. The journey to Jerusalem may bring many difficulties, and frustrate many of his plans. Hence the Romans must help him with their prayers. He begs the help of their prayers for the sake of Christ, the Master of them all, and through the love which the Holy Spirit enkindles in their hearts.

Paul asks the help of their intercession in the struggles that face him; his request is not that they should strive in prayer with him, but that they should join in his struggles by prayer, pray for him when he is struggling with difficulties (συναγωνίσασθαι). Paul is most anxious that his bringing of the alms to Jerusalem should promote the peace and unity of the Church. He often thus begs the prayers of the faithful (*Cf.* 2 Cor. i. 11; Phil. i. 19; Philm. 22; 1 Thess. v. 25; 2 Thess. iii. 1 f.; Eph. vi. 18).

31. The prayers of the Romans will help Paul against the unbelieving Jews at Jerusalem—who might force him—as they had previously done (*cf.* Acts xx. 3)—to change his plans; the prayers will also secure a favourable reception by the “Saints” of the offerings that Paul is bringing. The διακονία is the alms that he brings (*cf.* διακονῶν above, v. 25); a fairly well-supported reading here is ἡ δωροφορία (instead of ἡ διακονία): this may explain the peculiar Vulgate, *obsequii mei oblatio*. Paul is apparently uneasy about the attitude towards himself of the “Saints.” It is likely that opposition to the Gentile mission had not yet died out among the faithful in the Aramaic Mother Church—in spite of the Council of Jerusalem. Unfriendly Christians might reject the offerings brought by Paul through aversion or suspicion, and his work for peace and harmony between Jewish and Gentile Churches might be undermined. See the narrative in Acts xxi. 17 ff.

32. If his work in Jerusalem succeeds, Paul will come to Rome rejoicing—if it is God’s will. The ἵνα here is subordinated to the preceding ἵνα. The συναναπαύσωμαι recalls the συναγωνίσασθαι of v. 30. As they shall have all shared in the struggle, so they will all together share in the repose that follows it (ἀνάπαυσις). The Vulgate would be better if it read: *ut veniens . . . refrigerer*.

33. The prayer for peace may be suggested by the thought of struggle, or by the idea of repose (συναναπαύσωμαι). For the wish compare 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 16; Phil. iv. 9; compare also below, xvi. 20. Paul’s prayer contains no hint of the existence of discord among the faithful at Rome. Paul’s actual arrival in Rome was very different from the peaceful coming, with its promise of quiet restfulness,

here foreshadowed. His uneasiness about the attitude of Jerusalem was only too fully justified by the events of his visit to the Holy City (Acts xxi. 17-34). Instead of leaving Jerusalem quietly after handing over the offerings, Paul found himself hurried away stealthily as a prisoner to Cæsarea. For two years he had to live in imprisonment at Cæsarea. Then followed his appeal to the Emperor, and the journey to Rome, with the shipwreck and the enforced winter stay at Malta. It was thus three years after he had written the present context that Paul first beheld the imperial city.

(4) *An Introduction for Phœbe.* XVI, 1-2

1-2. Phœbe is recommended as a "sister"—i.e., as a Christian; the recommendation takes the form of an ἐπιστολή συστατική (cf. 2 Cor. iii. 1): συνίστημι = "I recommend." Phœbe was apparently about to undertake a journey to Rome on her own account, and St. Paul takes advantage of the occasion to entrust to her his Letter for the Romans. Paul does not ask the Romans to receive Phœbe, *if and when* she comes to Rome, so that we may accept the old tradition that makes her the actual bearer of the Letter to Rome. She will arrive *along with* the Letter (Cf. Zahn, *Römerbrief* ⁽³⁾, 605). If Phœbe were not the bearer of the Letter, Paul would surely refer in some way to the messenger who was to carry the Letter, and to arrive in Rome along with Phœbe! She is specially recommended on account of her office as διάκονος in Cenchreæ, the eastern port of Corinth.¹ The commentators agree that διάκονος here is equivalent to the later official title, διακόνισσα, which was not regularly in use until the second century. Some commentators regard Phœbe as the first of all the Deaconesses. The qualities required in a Deaconess are outlined in 1 Tim. v. 9 f. and Tit. ii. 3. In the early period the Deaconesses had the care of the sick and the poor. Later they helped in the teaching of the catechumens and at the baptism of females. In the course of her official work Phœbe had helped, and cared for, many—including even Paul himself. For this she ought to be able to count on a friendly reception at Rome. She is to be received "in the Lord"—i.e., as a member of Christ's Mystical Body, and she is also to be received ὁρίως τῶν ἁγίων—in a manner befitting Christians to receive a Christian, and befitting Christians to be received.

¹ Cenchreæ is not, as Michaelis has suggested in an article in ZNW, 1926, 144-154, a town in Troas.

Phœbe has been a προστάτις (which usually means a *patrona*, but here, apparently, is equivalent to παρυστάτις—a helper, protectress) of many, and therefore she deserves a kindly welcome. Possibly it was at Cenchreæ that Paul experienced her kindness. As there is some evidence that προστάτις (the masculine form of παρυστάτις) was the title of the legal representative or wealthy patron of Jewish communities, it has been conjectured that Phœbe was a person of wealth and position, who had acted as patroness of a small Jewish community (SH). But it is not certain that προστάτις is used here in a technical sense.

The praise which Paul here gives to Phœbe is very extraordinary. We know nothing about her subsequent career. She is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on the third of September.

(5) *Greetings to Friends in Rome.* XVI, 3-16

In other letters Paul sends greetings to certain individuals, and adds to his own greetings messages from friends who are with him. Compare, for instance, Col. iv. 10-17 and 2 Tim. iv. 19-21 (*Cf.* also 1 Cor. xvi. 19 f. and Philm. 23 f.). Usually Paul's greetings are general in form, and sometimes greetings are altogether omitted (*Cf.* Gal. ; Eph. ; 2 Thess. ; 1 Tim.). Here we have greetings to twenty-six individual Christians, and to five groups of Christians. This has led some critics to exclude this list of greetings from the Epistle to the Romans, and to regard it as a portion of a letter sent to some community already well known to Paul, such as Ephesus.

Yet it is natural for one, like Paul, who has never met the community to which he writes, to emphasise as much as possible, the extent of his acquaintanceship with members of the community in question. Besides, it would seem that many of those who are named were really friends or acquaintances whom Paul had met on his missionary tours.

3-4.

Aquila was a Jew of Pontus. He and his wife, Prisca, or Priscilla, were "tent-makers" by trade (Acts xviii. 2 f.). They had left Rome as a result of the Edict of Claudius in 49 or 50, and settled in Corinth. There Paul met them (Acts xviii. 1 f.). They went with him from Corinth to Ephesus, and helped in the evangelisation of Ephesus (Acts xviii. 26). Their house served as an assembly-place for the Ephesian Christians (1 Cor. xvi. 19). We do not know when they "put their neck under the executioner's axe" (put their lives in danger) for the sake of Paul. They

evidently returned to Rome when life there became again tolerable for Jews. In Rome, also, as is here evident, their house was an ἐκκλησίᾳ (v. 5)—as their house at Ephesus had been.

When Paul wrote his second letter to Timothy Aquila and Prisca were again in Ephesus (2 Tim. iv. 19)—whither, perhaps, the Neronian persecution had driven them. The Greek tradition makes them martyrs; and, according to the Apostolic Constitutions (vii.), Aquila became a bishop in Asia Minor. It is interesting to note that some recent critics have ascribed the composition of "Hebrews" to Prisca and Aquila. It is also interesting to note that Prisca's name is frequently put before that of her husband. This curious fact is explained by some scholars as due to the higher social standing of Prisca—it being conjectured that she was a member of a distinguished Roman family. It may, however, just as well be explained by her greater zeal for the faith. See the long and interesting note in SH.

"House-Churches"—such as that here mentioned (τὴν κοινὴν οἶκον ἐκκλησίαν)—were, apparently, numerous at Rome (Cf. vv. 14-15 below). "Churches" in our sense did not exist until a much later period, and wealthier Christians who possessed large houses were accustomed to put them at the disposal of groups of Christians as meeting-places for worship. See SH. *ad loc.*

5. Epænetus was a common Greek name; the person here named was, probably, a convert from heathenism. Paul's love for him is due partly to the excellence of his character, and partly to his being "the first-fruits unto Christ" (not, *in Christo*) of Asia (not of Achaia, as the Greek commentators read). He was, then, apparently, one of the first converts of the province of Asia (Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 15). He may have been converted by Prisca and Aquila, and may have moved with them from Ephesus, the metropolis of Asia, to Rome. Some ancient legends make Epænetus one of the Seventy-Two disciples, and bishop of Carthage.

6. Mary (Μαρία, is better attested than the more Hebrew form, Μαριάμ) would seem, from her name, to be a convert from Judaism. Her "much-toiling" was, probably, her many deeds of mercy and kindness for her fellow-Christians. Possibly, like Phœbe, she was a Deaconess. If εἰς ὑμᾶς (well-supported by MSS.: cf. Vulgate, *in vobis*) is the correct reading (rather than εἰς ἡμᾶς), she must have worked at Rome. The reading εἰς ἡμᾶς (read by Chrysostom, etc.) would suggest that Ephesus had been the chief scene of her labours, and the Aorist ἐκοπίασεν is in favour of this latter

view. If Paul had known her as a worker in Ephesus, she, as well as Epænetus, may have belonged to the "House-Church" of Aquila and Prisca at Ephesus. Zahn regards all the individuals mentioned up to v. 13 as members of that "House-Church." Mary he identifies with the Mother of James the Less (*Einleitung* I⁽³⁾, p. 275, note 2)—but there is no real evidence for the identification.

7. Andronicus and Junias are συγγενεῖς—that is, either blood-relatives, or fellow-tribesmen, or, more likely, fellow-countrymen, of Paul. They were once his fellow-prisoners. Junias, in itself, might be the name of a woman, but, in the context it is clearly a man's name. It is a contraction of Junianus. It has been suggested (by Kuehl) that the very definite statement here that these two men are fellow-countrymen (or relatives) of Paul, implies that the other persons in the present list who are not so described, are of Gentile origin. This theory, however, breaks down in reference to Aquila, Prisca, Maria, and, probably, Rufus and his mother.

Andronicus and Junias are ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις: this might mean that they stood in high repute with the Apostles (*i.e.*, the older Apostles), or that they were distinguished among the Apostles (*i.e.*, that they themselves were distinguished missionary preachers).

It has been argued that if Paul meant by "Apostles" here the older Apostles, he would have called them "the Twelve"; but those whom he calls "the Twelve" in 1 Cor. xv. 5., he calls "all the Apostles" in 1 Cor. xv. 7,

They had become Christians before Paul's conversion. Hence they had probably belonged to the Mother Church in Jerusalem, and had possibly been among the first Jewish Christians that preached at Antioch (Acts xi. 19 ff.).

In οἱ καὶ the οἱ certainly refers to Andronicus and Junias, and not to the "Apostles: γέγοναν is Alexandrian for γεγόνασιν.

The epithet "fellow-captives" applied to Andronicus and Junias causes some difficulty. At the time of writing this letter Paul had not endured, as far as we know, any long captivity. In 2 Cor. vi. 5 and xi. 23, written prior to the present letter, Paul speaks of imprisonments that he had endured. Possibly in one of these imprisonments the two men had been along with Paul (in prison). It would be possible to take "fellow-prisoners" as indicating that Andronicus and Junias had, like Paul, been imprisoned for the faith, though not necessarily at the same time as Paul. Origen explains the epithet as referring to the bondage of all three to Sin prior to their conversion. Other early com-

mentators (e.g., Chrysostom and Theodoret) take συναγματούτους as generally recalling the perils and difficulties which these two men had endured along with Paul in the preaching of the Gospel.

While it is impossible to determine the precise sense of συναγματούτους in this passage, it is obviously absurd to infer from the use of the word that Paul was in prison when he wrote the present verse.

It is not strange that so many Greek names appear here among the Roman Christians. The Roman community was Greek-speaking up to the third century. Lightfoot and Zahn point out that several of the names occurring in this chapter are found again among the household of the Emperor Claudius. The list of names in this chapter, instead of being a reason for doubting the Roman destination of the chapter, is in reality an argument in favour of accepting that destination.

8. Ampliatus is Paul's "dear friend in the Lord"; the name is a common Roman name of slaves. Ampliatus was probably a freedman. We do not know where Paul made his acquaintance. It has been conjectured that a crypt with the inscription *Ampliati*, found in the Domitilla Catacomb in 1880, belonged to the Ampliatus of the present text. The Ampliatus of the Catacomb was a freedman of the *Gens Aurelia*. This identification, however, is a mere conjecture. Early tradition supplies no reliable details about Ampliatus.

9. Urbanus was a frequent name in all grades of Roman society. Paul calls him "our (not, "my") fellow-worker," and from this it has been argued that Paul did not know him personally. This inference is, however, uncertain.

Stachys ("ear of corn") appears as a name of slaves and freedmen. Stachys is Paul's "dear friend"—but whether Paul knew him personally, or loved him because of what he had heard about him, cannot be decided. According to the Roman Martyrology of October 31st, Stachys was appointed by the Apostle Andrew first bishop of Constantinople.

10-11. The name Apelles (often borne by slaves and freedmen) occurs among Greeks, Romans, and Jews (*Cf.* Horace, Sat. i. 5, 100: *Credat Judæus Apella*). The name may possibly be corrupted from Apollodorus. Apelles is well-tested in Christ—tried and tested by suffering. Theodoret says of this epithet of Apelles: Ἀρετῆς ἄκρας ἡ μαρτυρία: τὸ γὰρ μηδὲν ἔχειν κίβδηλον τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐστὶ κολοφών. In the Roman Martyrology (April 22) Apelles is put among the first disciples of the Lord, and his death is placed in Smyrna.

The attempt to identify Apelles with the Alexandrian Apollo is not taken seriously by modern commentators.

"Those of Aristobulus" are probably the Christian slaves and freedmen of Aristobulus.

"The folk of Narcissus"¹ are, similarly, the Christians among the slaves and freedmen of Narcissus. It would seem from the context that neither Aristobulus nor Narcissus is reckoned among the Christians: possibly they were already dead. The clause describing the folk of Narcissus: τοὺς ὄντας ἐν κυρίῳ probably implies that they were not all Christians. On the other hand, it would seem that all the *Aristobuliani* were Christians.

Between the two groups of domestics comes the Jew (συγγενής), Herodion. Possibly he was a freedman of Aristobulus, and if he was, it is not improbable that Aristobulus was a grandson of Herod the Great who had lived in Rome as a friend of the Emperor Claudius, and had died before "Romans" was written. After his death his household would probably have become united with the imperial household (SH), retaining the name *Aristobuliani*. Herodion does certainly suggest connection with a Herodian family (See SH. and Zahn *ad loc.* Cf. Lightfoot, "Philippians," on Phil. iv. 22).

It is probably useless to seek to identify Narcissus with the Narcissus who was secretary of Claudius, and was murdered when Nero came into power (Suetonius, *Vita Claudii*, 28). When Narcissus was murdered the *Narcissiani* became the property of Nero. It has been suggested that these *Narcissiani* are partly identical with οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας of Phil. iv. 22. It might be conjectured equally that the *Aristobuliani* and others of those mentioned in the present chapter belonged also to the "Imperial household" of Phil. iv. 22 (See Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, for a discussion of this whole question).

12. Tryphaina, Tryphosa, and Persis were, probably, all deaconesses. The two first-named, probably sisters, are still actively engaged in their official work, but Persis apparently (like Mary of v. 6 above) has finished her task: she is called "beloved," and is thus set above the other two (Chrysostom). The three names, Tryphaina, Tryphosa, and Persis are known as slave-names. Tryphaina was a common name: Tryphosa occurs more rarely; Persis is very rare, but it is a typical slave name—"the Persian." The Roman Martyrology (November 10) says that Tryphaina and

¹ WW. read *ex Narcissi* without *domo*.

Tryphosa were converted at Iconium by the preaching of Paul, and the example of Thecla.¹

13. Rufus gets a very honourable epithet—"the Chosen in the Lord"—which probably refers to some specially extraordinary aspect of his call to the Faith. It is likely, therefore, that he is the son of Simon of Cyrene, whom the Roman Gospel of Mark mentions along with his brother, Alexander (Mark xv. 21). The mother of Rufus Paul calls his own mother also, because of the loving service which she has done for him. Paul may have experienced her kindness when he was a student at Jerusalem or when he stayed there for fifteen days on his first visit after his conversion.

Alexander, we may suppose, was not in Rome when Paul was writing—though he must have been well-known at Rome when Mark wrote his Gospel. The mention of Rufus is taken as a strong argument for the Roman destination of ch. xvi.

14. Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, and the brethren with them probably made up a "House-Church." It is likely that Paul did not know personally those who are named in this verse. All five names here mentioned appear in the inscriptions as slave-names.

There is no reason for identifying Hermas with the author of the *Pastor*. Phlegon appears as the name of a dog in Xenophon (*Cynegeticos* vii. 5). The historian Phlegon of Tralles, was a freedman of Hadrian. The full form of Patrobas was Patrobios. Hermas is either a dialect (Doric) form of Hermes, or a contraction of some name beginning with Herm—(Hermes).

15. Philologus, Julia, Nereus, the sister of Nereus, Olympas, and all the Saints with them formed also, probably, a "House-Church." It is likely that Julia was the wife of Philologus, Paul apparently had no personal knowledge of these people.

Note Ὀλυμπᾶν—not Ὀλυμπιάδα (Vulgate, *Olympiadem*). Olympas is a contraction of some such name as Olympiodorus. Olympias is a woman's name (Herod the Great had a daughter of this name).

Julia was a very common Roman name. Nereus is a mythological name, and was not very common.

Lagrange conjectures that Nereus and his sister were the children of Philologus and Julia. Other commentators are inclined to look on Philologus, Nereus, and Olympas as either

¹ A lady of royal lineage named Tryphaina appears prominently in the apocryphal *Acta Pauli et Theclæ*, and apparently there was a Tryphaina who was wife or mother of King Polemos II of Pontus (who reigned 35-41 A.D.). This Tryphaina of Pontus is probably the Tryphaina of the Acts of Paul and Thecla—but there is nothing more than the name to connect her with the Tryphaina of the present verse.

Presbyters or Deacons, and to regard the two women—Julia and the sister of Nereus, as Deaconesses.

We know nothing more than we have here about the people named in v. 14, except what is contained in the Roman Martyrology (Philologus; Nov. 4; Nereus, May 12), and even the identification of our Nereus with the Nereus of the Martyrology is uncertain. Greek tradition makes Olympas a martyr of the Neronian persecution.

16. The "holy kiss" is the liturgical kiss which expressed the unity of the faithful with each other and with Christ. A similar exhortation is found in 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12, and 1 Thess. v. 26. It has been conjectured that the Epistle would be read after the Lord's Supper, and that the reading of the letter was followed by the "holy kiss"; the kiss would include, as it were, the entire community, as represented by those greeted by Paul.

As the faith of the Romans is spoken of throughout the world (i. 8), all the Churches greet the Romans (*Cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 19). Some commentators think that the importance of the Roman Church, as compared with all others, is here insinuated. Paul did not need a special commission thus to speak for all the Churches; he knew the interest which the Churches of the East took in Rome.¹

The names mentioned in this list of greetings show that the Christian community at Rome consisted largely of slaves and freedmen, and, therefore, of poor and insignificant people. At Rome, as at Corinth (1 Cor. i. 26 ff), there were not among the Christians many that were σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα, οὐ πολλοὶ δυνατοί, οὐ πολλοὶ εὐγενεῖς.

The community was very mixed—including born Romans, and men from different countries, Jews and Gentiles. We see the Roman faithful grouped in "House-Churches"—meeting for worship and mutual encouragement. Among the faithful are women of extraordinary zeal who are prominent in charitable work; and some of them appear to belong to the official group of Deaconesses.

The view has been put forward that Paul had known personally in the East at least ten of the people greeted in this chapter, and that the ten in question—Aquila, Prisca, Epānetus, Andronikus, Junias, Ampliatus, Urbanus, Stachys, Rufus and his mother—had in the meantime settled in Rome, and doubt has been cast on such a large "exodus" from the

¹ It is natural for Paul to send a greeting from Corinth to Rome in the name of all the Churches, for he has been up to the time of writing in close contact with all the Eastern Churches. It would be difficult to think of him as sending such a greeting from Rome to Ephesus after an imprisonment of more than two years.

East. When we look closer, however, we find that there is no proof that Paul was personally acquainted with Ampliatus, Urbanus or Stachys. Paul's personal acquaintance with Epænetus is also uncertain. Thus it is certain only in regard to six that they had moved from the East to Rome, and at least Aquila and Prisca had been previously settled in Rome. There is, therefore, no implication in the present chapter of considerable movement from the East to Rome. Critics who fancy that the greetings in chapter xvi. were really addressed to Ephesus are unable to show connection with Ephesus in regard to more than three of those here named—Aquila, Prisca, and Epænetus.

(6) *A Word of Warning against False Teachers.* XVI, 17-20

17. Though the Roman Church is full of peace and harmony, it may come to be disturbed like other churches (such as the Galatian and the Corinthian) by the intrigues of false teachers. We can imagine Paul as here taking the pen from the hand of Tertius to set down a few specially impressive words, and when he has written as far as v. 20, returning the pen to the Scribe (*Cf.* Gal. vi. 11-16). He wishes to put the Romans on their guard—so that they may keep on the watch against (σκοπεῖν) all who would question the true doctrine which they have learned. Paul does not imply that the false teachers are already at Rome—for σκοπεῖν suggests a look-out into the distance. But he knows that such false teachers are likely to visit Rome. Neither does Paul clearly say that there are already divisions and scandals in the Roman Church; he may be merely thinking of what has happened elsewhere, and putting the Romans on their guard against the infiltration of troubles (among themselves). It is not quite clear whether Paul has here in view Judaisers (like those in Antioch, Galatia, and Corinth), or Christians (whether Jewish or Gentile) who would introduce a false freedom or libertinism.

The dissensions (δισσορασίαι) might be party divisions, and the "scandals" the dangers of religious and moral perversion thence arising (*Cf.* Gal. v. 20; Matth. xviii. 7). Lietzmann thinks that the "divisions" and "scandals" lay in the matters discussed above in xiv-xv. 13.

Παρὰ τὴν διδασχὴν suggests that the disturbers aimed—or would aim—at attacking the *traditional doctrine*. This verse is an important text for the Catholic doctrine on Tradition (*Cf.* vi. 17; Gal. i. 8; 1 John ii. 20 ff.; 2 John 9; Jud. 3).

The correct attitude towards false teachers is indicated by : ἐκκλίνετε ἅπ' αὐτῶν. For a similar principle of avoidance see 2 Tim. ii. 16, 23 ; iii. 5 ; iv. 15 ; Tit. iii. 9 ; 2 John 10 (Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 11). The words ἐκκλίνετε ἅπ' αὐτῶν do not prove that the false teachers are already in Rome : they may refer, as a warning, to what is still in the future.

When Paul speaks here of "the teaching which ye have learned," he is obviously addressing a Church that he himself has not taught. This excludes the hypothesis that verses 17-20 were addressed to Ephesus. Writing to Ephesians Paul would have said : "The teaching ye received from me" (Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 1-2 ; 1 Cor. xi. 2, etc.).

18. This verse would seem to suggest that the false teachers are Libertinists, whose interest is in eating and drinking and sensual enjoyment generally. These men have the gift of flattery and "pious" speech, by which they capture the unsuspecting.

Χρηστολογία (a *hapax legomenon*) and εὐλογία may refer to the content and to the form of the speeches respectively.¹ The Vulgate has *dulces sermones et benedictiones*. The ἄκακοι are those who suspect no evil.

19. The γάρ seems to require some such preceding phrase inserted as "I have no fear about you."

Gutjahr completes the thought thus : "I hold this warning (v. 18) not to be superfluous ; but I want something further—for your faith is universally known, and I rejoice over you on that account." The further thing he would have from them is that they should wisely guard the good (the true doctrine they have received) and fly from evil (*i.e.*, the errors of the false teachers). The "obedience" here is not obedience to Paul, but to the Gospel (Cf. i. 6 ; vi. 17).

20. These words are meant to comfort the readers. God, the Author of peace, will soon overthrow Satan—whose agents and instruments the false teachers are. God will so smite Satan (who works through the false teachers) that the Romans may tread him under foot. This is not a statement of the nearness of the Parousia, but the expression of Paul's conviction that God's enemies will soon be destroyed. The *conterat* of the Vulgate is probably a corruption of a correct original *conteret*.

The wish in 20b often appears in the Pauline letters (Cf. 1 Thess. v. 25 ; 2 Thess. iii. 18 ; Gal. vi. 18 ; 1 Cor. xvi. 23). This wish appears in some MSS. after v. 23. In the Vulgate

¹ Εὐλογία may possibly suggest would-be pious, or canting, speech. Lietzmann illustrates χρηστολογία from the definition of a χρηστολόγος in Julius Capitolinus Pertinax, 13 : X. *eum appellantes, qui bene loqueretur et male faceret*.

it appears both in *v.* 20 and (in a slightly enlarged form) after *v.* 23.

The insertion of the warning (*vv.* 17-20) between the list of those greeted, and the list of those who send greetings (21-23) has led some critics to exclude verses 17-20 from the genuine text of "Romans." It has been held that the words of earnest warning in 17-20 would be out of place in a letter addressed to a Church not personally known to Paul, while they would be perfectly natural as part of a letter sent to a Pauline Church, like Ephesus. It is argued, too, that Paul would not call the Romans ἄκακοι (*v.* 18), and it is pointed out that the false teachings designated in these verses are nowhere else clearly discussed in the Epistle.

Against such *a priori* reasoning it must be emphasised that an interruption of the greetings would be an argument against the authenticity of *vv.* 17-20 only if Paul, in his postscripts, were absolutely bound to a definite arrangement; but the freedom of the epistolary form left the ordering of postscripts—whether greetings or instructions—entirely to the writer. Moreover, it is not obvious that Paul could not have adopted the serious manner of *vv.* 17-20 when addressing a strange Church. In any case, the warning in *vv.* 17-20 is not more deliberate and authoritative than other instructions and warnings in the admittedly genuine portions of "Romans." No censure of the Roman mind or character is insinuated in styling them ἄκακοι: as compared with the Ephesians or Corinthians they might well be thought of by Paul as "unsuspecting," and, therefore, in peculiar need of warning. It was pointed out above that the words πρὸς τὴν διδοχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε are just what we should expect from Paul when addressing a Church, like Rome, not founded by himself.

(7) *Greetings from Friends at Corinth.* XVI, 21-24

21. Λούκιος, as a συγγενής of Paul, cannot be identified with the Evangelist Luke—who was of Gentile origin (Col. iv. 11). His identification with Lucius of Cyrene (Acts xiii. 1), though not impossible, is improbable.

Jason has often been identified with the Jason of Acts xvii. 5 ff. If, as may, perhaps, be conjectured, this Jason was one of the Macedonian delegates who were to accompany Paul to Jerusalem (2 Cor. viii. 18 ff.; ix. 4), it follows that *vv.* 21-23 were written at Corinth on the Third Missionary Tour.

Sosipatros (Vulgate, *Sosipater*) may be the Sopater of

Acts xx. 4—one of Paul's companions on the journey from Corinth to Jerusalem. Ancient notices make him bishop of Iconium.

Though Timothy was with Paul when "Romans" was being written, the Letter is not sent as if it were a joint message from Paul and Timothy, like 1 Thess. and 2 Thess., 2 Cor., Philm., and Phil. The reason is obviously that Timothy was not personally known to the Church at Rome.

22. Tertius, who has written the Letter to Paul's dictation, here puts in a word on his own account. Tertius appears in Greek tradition as second bishop of Iconium. Possibly Tertius, whose name is Latin, was known to the Roman Christians. Nowhere else in the Pauline letters is the scribe mentioned, though Paul probably employed scribes for all his longer compositions.

23. Gaius is probably the Gaius of 1 Cor. i. 14 whom Paul had baptised. Paul is apparently the guest of Gaius, and, probably, because the whole Christian community meets for worship in his house, he is called the host of the whole Church (Note Vulgate, *et universa ecclesia*, instead of *et universæ ecclesiæ*). Some critics identify Gaius with the Macedonian (Philippian ?) Gaius of Acts xix. 29.

Commentators are now-a-days unwilling to identify Erastus with the Erastus who appears as a companion of Paul in Acts xix. 22 : they are more inclined to identify him with the Erastus of 2 Tim. iv. 20, and thus to connect him with Corinth. Paul calls him ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως—financial administrator of the city (*i.e.*, of Corinth).

It is interesting to find a Quartus as well as a Tertius in the list. We know nothing about Quartus. Probably, like the scribe, Tertius, he was personally known to the Romans.

The official Vulgate text here repeats 20b with additions : *Gratia Domini nostri Jesu Christi cum omnibus vobis. Amen* : this is reckoned as v. 24 in the Vulgate. It is omitted by WW.

(8) *The Doxology* XVI, 25-27

One of the chief purposes of the Epistle is to strengthen the Romans in the Faith (i. 11 ; xv. 15). In the concluding Doxology Paul turns in praise and homage to Him Who alone has power to give men strength of faith ; and in Paul's words of praise is implicitly contained a petition that God may use His faith-strengthening power for the readers of the Epistle. In i. 11 Paul expressed his longing to see the Romans so as to impart to them a χάρισμα πνευματικόν that they "might be made strong" (*i.e.*, in faith). The prayer implied in the

Doxology is that He who is *δυνάμενος στηρίξαι* may give the *χάρισμα πνευματικόν* of i. 11.

25. The Faith in which the Romans are to be made strong is that which "is according to my Gospel"—i.e., according to the Gospel preached by Paul. The Gospel of Paul is here by implication equated with the Gospel as preached by the other Apostolic teachers—seeing that he had not previously proclaimed his Gospel in Rome. The Gospel of Paul is, then, further equated with the *κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*—his Gospel, that is, has Jesus Christ for its theme (*Cf.* i. 1-3). *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* is a *genitivus objectivus*.¹ The Peshitta text makes this clear, rendering, "the Gospel, which was preached concerning Jesus Christ."²

Since the Gospel of Paul is the heralding forth of Jesus Christ, it is obviously in conformity with the will of God; for God's eternal decree of redemption is shown to be accomplished in Christ. The "preaching of Jesus Christ" is the making known of a mystery which was kept hidden in silence in "eternal ages" (from eternity): it is the proclamation of a divine decree which for ages immeasurable was spoken in no ear (*cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 7 ff.); and when it did come to be spoken of, it was, for centuries, only vaguely hinted at, or obscurely shadowed forth. It could not be known at all without revelation: for it was a *μυστήριον* (*cf.* v. 17; xi. 25; 1 Cor. iv. 1)—*τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*—as Paul calls it in Col. iv. 3, something that is, not indeed unintelligible, but so hidden away in God's counsels that only through divine revelation could it become known to men.

26. But the mystery that in the ages of eternity was proclaimed to none, and in ancient revelation was but dimly shadowed forth, is now fully made known. It has been clearly shown forth in the person and work of Christ Himself: it has, further, been proclaimed to the world in the Apostolic preaching. That preaching has constantly made use of the "prophetic writings"—the Scriptures in which God promised by His prophets the coming of Jesus. The "preaching of Christ" is already contained in germ in the Old Testament,

¹ Compare 1 Cor. ii. 1-2; xv. 3, 11; 2 Cor. iv. 5; xi. 4.

² That "the preaching of Jesus Christ" is Our Lord's own preaching, the message which He Himself proclaimed during His Public Life, is a view held by many authorities, ancient and modern. This view is less likely than the other. Paul, in the context, is not concerned with asserting the conformity of his own teaching to that of Christ, but only with indicating the subject-matter of His preaching, the mystery of Jesus.

Harnack regards the words *τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* as a Catholic tendentious addition to the Doxology. The Doxology, in Harnack's view, is the work of disciples of Marcion. See Harnack, *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. Leipzig, 1921, p. 146.

and showing it to be so present in the Old Testament Scriptures was a powerful proof that it was a message from God. And as a directly divine message it demanded the acceptance (ὑπακοή) of faith from those to whom it was proclaimed.

In this explanation φανερωθέντος is taken as referring to the manifestation of the mystery in Christ Himself and His work, and γνωρισθέντος¹ is assumed to refer to the processes of Apostolic proclamation of the "mystery of Christ." The four clauses introduced respectively by the prepositions διὰ, κατὰ, εἰς, εἰς, all belong to γνωρισθέντος; the Apostolic heralding of Christ has been ordered by God (κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου Θεοῦ); it has made extensive use of the Messianic references in the Old Testament (διὰ γραφῶν προφητικῶν): the purpose of the heralding has been to secure adhesion to the Gospel (εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως), and the sphere of its application is universal (εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη).

The "mystery of Christ," and of the call of all men, Gentiles as well as Jews, to salvation through faith in Christ, has been the theme of Paul's Gospel. That theme was no human invention: it has been made known through the full revelation brought to the world by the Word of God, and, in publishing it to the world of Jews and heathens, the Apostolic preachers have been helped by the Holy Spirit—for without the special help of God's Spirit even the Apostles could not deeply understand the mystery that was manifested in Our Lord Himself (*Cf.* Luke xxiv. 44).

It is important to note the stages and processes here indicated in making accessible to men salvation through Christ:

- (a) The eternal decree of God, hidden from eternity.
- (b) Its φανέρωσις in the Incarnation and the redemptive work of Christ (*Cf.* Col. i. 26, 27; 1 Tim. i. 16).
- (c) This φανέρωσις itself required an ἀποκάλυψις to be fully grasped by the Apostolic preachers.
- (d) The publication of the mystery of Christ to the world—particularly to the heathens (*Cf.* ix. 22 f. The Vulgate *cogniti*² is not adequate: the reference is to making known, rather than being known).
- (e) The Apostolic heralding made extensive appeal to prophecy and its fulfilment in Christ (*Cf.* i. 2;

¹ Note that γνωρισθέντος is connected closely with φανερωθέντος by the particle τε: the sense is: "Manifested and, accordingly, proclaimed."

² WW. read *cognito*, which would have to be read with *solī sapienti Deo*: this is plainly opposed to the meaning of the Greek text.

iii. 21; Heb. i. 2; ix. 15; x. 13 ff.; xv. 9 ff.; Acts xvii. 2). This appeal to prophecy and its fulfilment is a marked feature of the Gospels of Matthew and John.

(f) The Apostolic heralding of Christ was not initiated or carried out by the Apostles on their own authority: it was expressly commanded by God (*Cf.* i. 5; Matth. xxviii. 18; Mark xvi. 15; 1 Tim. i. 1; Tit. i. 3). Paul himself had been formally commissioned to preach to the Gentiles. The emphasis on the Gentile Mission here (εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη)—is one of the many indications that the Roman community was mainly of Gentile origin. God is called “eternal” in connection with His command to preach the Gospel, because that preaching is a means to the attainment of the full effects of God’s eternal decree to call all men to salvation in Christ.

(g) The purpose of the Apostolic preaching was to lead the heathen to the submission of faith (*Cf.* i. 5).

27. The μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ resumes τῷ δυναμένῳ of v. 25. God is wise because His wisdom alone could devise the eternal decree of Redemption, and determine the date of its fulfilment and publication, and the methods to be used to secure its full effects.

As all heavenly blessings come through Jesus Christ (i. 8; vii. 25), so through Him should the praise and thanks of redeemed humanity be offered to the Father (Col. iii. 17).

It has been held that with ϣ a second Doxology begins, due to the mention of Our Lord (*cf.* xiii. 21)—as if Paul could not let the Holy Name go without a doxology whenever it was mentioned in a context of praise and thanks. But if ϣ is made to refer to Christ, the Doxology to the Father remains incomplete. It is better, then, to take ὦ as resuming μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ; “to the only wise God through Jesus Christ—to Him be,” etc. In this view there is only one Doxology—that to the Father—in the context. The construction would be easier if we could omit ϣ (with Zahn and others), as due to the carelessness of a scribe, who was accustomed to conclude with a relative clause so introduced. The textual support of this view is, however, negligible, and the ϣ is textually certain.

The phrase μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ does not mean so much, “God Who is sole and wise,” as, “God, the uniquely wise.” The phrase recalls xi. 33.

Some MSS. omit τῶν αἰωνῶν.

The Authenticity of the Doxology

The Doxology (xvi. 25-27) has been explained above as a genuine portion of St. Paul's Letter to the Romans, and it has been shown that it moves in the same sphere of thought as the doctrinal sections of the Epistle generally. It has been held, however, by several liberal critics that the Doxology is neither a part of the Epistle to the Romans, nor even Pauline in origin. In the Introduction the problem of the authenticity of chapters xv and xvi has been dealt with in general. It may be well to deal here specially with the authenticity of the Doxology. The admirable study of Dr. Schumacher referred to above (*Die beiden letzten Kapitel des Römerbriefes*) discusses the matter at length, and students will be well advised to study that work carefully. They should also read closely the *Note sur la Doxologie* in Lagrange (380-386) and his *Addenda* on the same subject (p. 400 f.).

Doubts about the authenticity of the Doxology are based chiefly on the variations of textual tradition. Some ancient texts apparently omitted the Doxology: others gave it varying positions. Six different forms of tradition have been distinguished:

- (1) Complete omission of chapters xv and xvi—so that the Epistle ends with xiv. 23.
- (2) Epistle ends with xiv. 23 + Doxology (xv and xvi. 1-23 being omitted).
- (3) The Epistle is thus arranged: i-xiv. 23; Doxology; xv-xvi. 23; xvi. 24 (this verse varying: it does not belong to the original text and is omitted in all critical editions of the Greek New Testament).
- (4) i-xiv. 23; xv-xvi. 23; Doxology.
- (5) i-xiv. 23; Doxology; xv-xvi. 23; Doxology.
- (6) i-xiv. 23; xv-xvi. 23; xvi. 24.

For (1) the evidence is supplied by Origen in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans as transmitted to us in the Latin version of Rufinus (Migne, P. G., xiv). Origen's Commentary on "Romans" was composed about the year 245. Rufinus' rendering of the Commentary (made at the beginning of the fifth century) was based, apparently, on defective manuscripts, so that we cannot always be sure that Origen's thought is exactly conveyed in the text of Rufinus.

The evidence referred to is contained in Origen's remarks on Rom. xvi. 25-27. The text of Rufinus says: *Caput hoc*

Marcion, a quo Scripturæ evangelicæ atque apostolicæ interpolatæ sunt, de hac epistula penitus abstulit ; et non solum hoc, sed et ab (or, in) eo loco ubi Scriptum est " Omne autem, quod non ex fide, peccatum est " (= xiv. 23), usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit. In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est in his, quæ non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput (i.e., xvi. 25-27) diverse positum invenimus. In nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum, quem supra diximus, hoc est, " Omne autem quod non est ex fide peccatum est " (= xiv. 23), statim cohærens habetur, " ei autem, qui potens est vos confirmare " (= xvi. 25 f.), alii vero codices in fine id, ut nunc est positum, continent.

It is reasonable to suppose that Rufinus gives us here an exact rendering of the words of Origen, for Rufinus had no familiarity with Marcion's Bible, nor any special personal interest in Marcion's Biblical theories. According to Origen, then, Marcion completely rejected the Doxology (xvi. 25-27), and *dissecuit* xv. and xvi. 1-23. There has been considerable discussion about the meaning of *dissecuit*. If it means " cut off," or " cut away," Origen must be understood to say that Marcion made " Romans " to end with xiv. 23 ; and there is no antecedent improbability in this, for chapter xv. contains passages that Marcion would regard as objectionable (for instance, verses 3-4, 8, 9-12, 27), and chapter xvi., with its multitude of greetings, some of which are definitely addressed to Jews, might seem to Marcion too favourable to Judaism. Moreover, if Marcion knew of MSS. in which ἐν Πῶμῃ was absent in i. 7, 15—as some critics allege that he did—he would consider the Epistle generally as addressed to the *whole* Church, and in such an encyclical Epistle so many special greetings would be out of place.

That *dissecuit* can be taken as equivalent to *desecuit* has been argued on the ground that the preposition *de* appears in compounds in Vulgar Latin indifferently as *di* and *dis* (See Article by Corssen in ZNW, 1909, p. 13 f.)

It has been argued by Zahn, Lagrange, and others that *dissecuit* must be understood as meaning " mutilated," particularly as the words of Rufinus, *et non solum hoc sed et . . .* imply in the Greek original, οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ, and this Greek formula demands a different sort of activity in *dissecuit* from that indicated in *penitus abstulit*. Origen could not have said : " Marcion not only completely removed xvi. 25-27, but he cut away xv. 1-xvi. 24." This reasoning, however, is not accepted by the advocates of the other view ; they argue that Origen could well say : " M. not merely removed xvi. 25-27, but he cut away everything from

xv. 1 to xvi. 24." They point out, moreover, that there is support for the reading *desecuit* (instead of *dissecuit*) in Rufinus in the 9th century St. Gall MS., No. 88.

All things considered we are justified in regarding Origen as testifying to the existence, in his time, of a Marcionite Bible which made "Romans" to end with xiv. 23.

The existence of text-form (2), in which the Epistle is brought to a close by the Doxology immediately following xiv. 23, is proved by the list of chapter-headings found in Vulgate Manuscripts, usually known as the *Capitulatio Amiatina*. This *Capitulatio*, in dealing with the Epistle to the Romans, makes the Doxology to follow immediately on xiv. 23, and omits all reference to xv and xvi. 1-24. This *Capitulatio* as it appears, for instance, in the *Codex Amiatinus*, is obviously derived from an Old Latin Bible. In the *Codex Fuldensis* there is also a *Summarium* (or *Capitulatio*) which evidently supposes the existence of an Old Latin Bible in which "Romans" included only i.-xiv. 23 + Doxology.

It has been alleged also that a fragment from the Bibliotheca Capitolare of Monza (I₂^o; 9th or 10th century) and two MSS. from Schäftlarm (in Munich : Nos. 17040 and 17043) are evidence for the existence of a Latin recension of Form (2). Apparently, however, in these texts the Doxology does not follow immediately on xiv. 23; the verse which appears in the Vulgate as xvi. 24¹ intervenes between xiv. 23 and the Doxology, and from a recent article of De Bruyne in the *Révue Benedictine* (1930, No. 2), it would seem that the absence of chapters xv. and xvi. from the type of text of "Romans" represented by the manuscripts here in question, is merely an inference. The only reliable evidence, then, for the existence of a Latin Bible that omitted chapters xv. and xvi from "Romans," is that supplied by the *Capitulatio Amiatina*, and that evidence refers only to the pre-Jeromite, or Old Latin Bible. It must be noted also that no satisfactory evidence has yet been brought forward for the existence of Greek Codices containing Form (2).

The existence of Form (6)—containing everything but the Doxology—has been argued by Corssen. He has tried to prove that Z, the conjectured archetype of the MSS. D, F, G did not contain the Doxology. G (*Boernerianus*) has a blank space sufficient for the Doxology after xiv. 23. F (*Augiensis*) does not leave a space after xiv. 23, but it gives only the Latin form of the Doxology at the end.

¹ The Vulgate v. 24 is really a repetition of v. 20b, and its presence is, therefore, in a sense, an argument for the existence of the longer form of the Epistle containing chapters xv. and xvi.

D (*Claromontanus*) has the Doxology at the end of the Epistle, but it is in a different style of script from the rest of the Epistle (See Goguel, *Introduction*, iv. 241 ff.)

The Bobbio MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, which is known as E 26 inf, seems also to belong to the sixth class of text-forms. In Priscillian's Bible also the Doxology was missing.

The Forms (3), (4), (5), all have the Doxology, but differ in regard to its position, and we know from the passage of Rufinus quoted above that, even in Origen's day, there was diversity of opinion among Catholics as to the proper place of the Doxology. Origen favoured (4), and his view is supported by the best MSS. (X, B, C, D, E, 16, 66, 80, 137, 176), and the more important versions. In several of the MSS. that support Form (4) there is divergency in regard to xvi. 24. This verse is absent in X, B, C, 137, the Fuldensis, Amiatinus, the Bohairic version, etc.; in other MSS. xvi. 24 follows xvi. 27. In D, E, f the Doxology follows on xvi. 24.

The Form (3) is supported by L.—representing the Antiochian Recension, and by most of the cursive MSS. It is known also from Chrysostom and Theodoret.

For (5) there is the support of A and P, a few Greek cursives (5, 17, 37, 109) and some Armenian MSS.

All this variety of textual forms is compatible with the authenticity of the Doxology. It is obvious from what has been said that there is no real evidence of the rejection of the Doxology in manuscripts prior to Marcion. The ancient manuscript support for Form (6) is merely conjectural: no genuine support for the pre-Marcionite exclusion of the Doxology can be found in any ancient writer. The statement of Origen quoted above seems definitely to exclude the theory adopted by some scholars that Marcion, in rejecting xv. and xvi. was influenced by existing manuscripts. It is quite unreasonable to suppose that an ancient Catholic tradition of a short form of "Romans" could have been maintained and transmitted by Marcion and the Marcionites alone.

To Marcion's influence, then, both the absence of the Doxology from the text of "Romans," and its varying position may ultimately be traced. It is quite likely that Marcionite scribes, realising the abruptness with which xiv. 23 concludes the Epistle, added to their text the Doxology from the Catholic Bible. Catholic scribes, then, confused by this new Marcionite text-form (i-xiv. 23 + xvi. 25-27), began to be doubtful about chapters xv. and xvi., and, finally, omitted them, thus introducing into Catholic

circles Form (2). When the doubts concerning chapters xv. and xvi. were at last completely set aside, the two chapters were restored, and the Doxology was repeated at the end of xvi.

Against this explanation of the textual phenomena connected with the Doxology it may be objected that Marcionite influence could not have thus deeply affected the Catholic Bible. Yet commentators have no difficulty in admitting Marcionite influence in the text of "Romans" in i. 7, 14, 16, and some Catholic scholars believe that the short Prologues which are often prefixed to the Pauline Epistles in Latin Bibles are of Marcionite origin.¹

If we admit the direct effect of Marcionite influence on Catholic Bibles in certain departments, it seems unreasonable to allege the antecedent improbability of that influence in other directions.

Other objections have been advanced against the authenticity of the Doxology.

It has been objected (a) that St. Paul does not conclude any other Epistle by a Doxology; (b) that the Doxology shows an un-Pauline turgidity of style; and (c) that it betrays tendencies towards Gnosticism.

As to (a), it is obvious that Paul could not conclude such an Epistle as the present with the words καὶ Κουᾶπρος ὁ ἁδελφός (xvi. 23).² It will be seen from a study of the Epistle generally that Paul turns to God in a solemn way at the end of each important discussion (cf. viii. 32 ff.; xi. 33 ff.; xv. 13), and so here, at the conclusion of the Epistle in a peculiarly solemn fashion he praises God in words which suggest an attitude of awe and gratitude for the mystery of divine graciousness revealed in the call of men to the Faith. Besides, the Doxology, as Lagrange points out, repeats the leading thought of the Epistle after the manner of the *inclusio* in Semitic poetry—as a sort of *quod erat demonstrandum*!

¹ Dom de Bruyne is a strong advocate of this view (Cf. *Rev. Bénédictine*, 1907, 1-16). Lagrange for a while accepted the standpoint of De Bruyne, but recently he has abandoned it, and now follows Mundle (cf. ZNW, 1925, 56-77) in tracing the Prologues to Ambrosiaster. See *Rev. Biblique*, 1926, 161-173. See also *Rev. Biblique*, 1921, 602-611, for a statement of Lagrange's views on Marcionite influence generally in a review of Harnack's *Marcion*. The Marcionite origin of the Prologues is maintained by the non-Catholic scholars, Lietzmann, Wordsworth and White, Burkitt, Souter, Zahn, Harnack, etc. A reply to Mundle's article, *Die Herkunft der "marcionitischen" Prologe zu den paulinischen Briefen* (ZNW, 1925, 56-77) was made by Harnack in an article, *Der marcionitische Ursprung der ältesten Vulgata-Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen* in ZNW, 1925, 204-218.

² It is assumed, with editors of the Greek New Testament, such as Nestle, Vogels, Merk., etc., that v. 24 is merely a repetition of v. 20b.

In reply to (b) it may be admitted that the Doxology is wanting in clarity, and in precision of linguistic structure. But the very awkwardness, and the anacoluthic character of the Doxology are an argument in favour of its authenticity (as Jacquier points out, *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament*, i, 273). Moreover, the great importance and the enormous emotional appeal of the theme of this long Epistle lead naturally to this attempt to express in a few solemn phrases at the end, the central thoughts of the Epistle and the writer's exaltation of spirit.

(c) The "Gnosticising" tendencies of the Doxology are found in the expressions *μυστήριον, σεσιγημένον, διὰ γραφῶν προφητικῶν γνωρισθέν, θεὸς αἰώνιος, χρόνοι αἰώνιοι, μόνος σοφὸς θεός*. The meaning of these expressions has been explained in the Commentary, and it has been shown that each of them fits naturally into its context when taken in a normal Pauline fashion. The thoughts and expressions of the Doxology should be compared in detail with those of i. 1-7, and xi. 33-36, and the comparison will show how intimately and naturally the Doxology is connected with the doctrinal section of the Epistle. The contacts in thought and language between the Doxology and "Ephesians" and "Colossians" are an additional proof of the Pauline origin of the Doxology.

The failure of the critics to suggest a sufficient reason for the fabrication of the Doxology by any early editor of "Romans," and their still more complete failure in identifying the "author" of the alleged fabrication, are additional strong arguments for the authenticity of the Doxology. In view of Origen's statement that Marcion completely removed the Doxology from the text of "Romans," it is obviously futile to suppose (with certain recent authorities) that Marcion composed the Doxology, and it is just as futile to maintain that it was the work of Marcionites. In any case, there is nothing that can be identified as Marcionite in the Doxology!



TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

INTRODUCTION. I, 1-17

(1) THE ADDRESS. I, 1-7

1. Paul, slave of Christ Jesus,
called as Apostle,
set apart for the Gospel of God
2. which He formerly announced by His prophets
in Holy Writings,
3. about His Son,
Who was (born) of the seed of David
according to the flesh,
4. Who has been marked out as Son of God
by deeds of might corresponding to the Spirit of Holiness,
since the Resurrection of the Dead,
Jesus Christ Our Lord,
5. through Whom we have received
grace and apostolic office
to [bring about] submission to Faith
among all the Gentiles,
for the honour of His Name,
6. among whom are ye also,
ye called of Jesus Christ—
7. To all the beloved of God
that are at Rome,
saints who have been called !
Grace be with you and Peace
from God, Our Father,
and from the Lord Jesus Christ !

(2) REASONS FOR WRITING TO THE ROMANS. I, 8-15

8. First of all I thank my God through Jesus Christ
on account of you all,
because your faith is proclaimed
in the whole world.
9. For God, Whom I serve in my spirit,
in the Gospel of His Son,
is my witness, that I constantly
make memory of you,
10. always petitioning in my prayers
that I may, at long last, with God's will,
come to you.

11. For I long to see you
that I may impart to you some spiritual gift
unto your strengthening—
12. that is to say—
unto *the* comforting of myself also in your midst,
through our common Faith—your's and mine.
13. But I will not have you unaware, brethren,
that I have often planned to come to you,
—but I have been hindered so far—
that I might have some fruit among you,
even as among the other Gentiles.
14. To Greeks and Barbarians,
to the cultured, and the uncultured,
I owe a duty,
15. and so, I am, on my part, very ready
to announce the Gospel to you also,
who are at Rome.

(3) THEME OF THE EPISTLE. GOD'S JUSTICE REVEALED IN
THE GOSPEL. I, 16-17

16. For I am not ashamed of the Gospel,
for it is a power of God unto salvation
to everyone that believes,
the Jew first, and, then, the Gentile.
17. For in it is revealed the justice of God
from faith and unto faith ;
as it is written :
“ But he that is just by faith lives.”

A. DOGMATIC SECTION.

THE GOSPEL IS A POWER OF GOD THAT BRINGS SALVATION.
JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. I, 18-XI, 36

I. UNIVERSAL NEED OF SALVATION. I, 18-III, 20

a. CORRUPTION OF THE HEATHEN WORLD. I, 18-32

(1) *Heathen idolatry.* I, 18-23

18. For the wrath of God manifests itself from heaven
against every impiety and injustice of men
who suppress truth by injustice ;
19. For that which is knowable about God
is evident among them :
for God has made it clear to them.

20. For that which in Him is invisible
is looked upon since the creation of the world,
being grasped by reason through [His] works—
His eternal power and divinity !
So that they are without excuse,
21. because, though they knew God,
they did not give Him honour or thanks as God ;
but they became futile in their thoughts,
and their stupid heart was darkened.
22. Boasting that they were wise
they became foolish ;
23. and they exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God
for an image representing corruptible man,
and birds, and quadrupeds, and creeping things.

(2) *Heathen corruption.* I, 24-32

24. Hence God gave them up, [enmeshed as they were]
in the lusts of their hearts,
to impurity,
so that they defiled one another's bodies.
25. For they had exchanged the truth of God for lies,
and had honoured and worshipped the creature
rather than the Creator—
Who is blessed for ever. Amen !
26. Hence God gave them up to shameful passions ;
for even their women
have exchanged natural usage for unnatural ;
27. and, similarly, the men
have discarded natural intercourse with women,
and have burned with passion for one another,
males working deeds of shame on males,
and experiencing in themselves
the due requital of their perversion.
28. And as they did not deem it worth while
to know God rightly,
God gave them up to a perverse mind,
so that they did what was disgraceful,
29. being full of
every injustice, of malignity, avarice, malice ;
steeped in
envy, murder, strife, treachery, evil-devising ;
30. secret calumniators, slanderers, abhorrent to God,
outrageous, insolent, arrogant, plotters of sin,
disobedient to parents ;
31. religiously blind, inconstant,
without love, without pity.

32. Though they know God's decree
that they who do such things
are deserving of death,
they not only do them themselves,
but even commend those who do them.

b. CORRUPTION OF THE JEWISH WORLD. II, 1-III, 20

- (1) *Jews condemn others for doing what they themselves do.*
II, 1-4

- II, 1. Hence thou art without excuse,
thou, whoever thou art, that judgest [others];
for in judging others
thou condemnest thyself,
for thou dost the same things—
thou that judgest!
2. But we know
that God's judgment according to truth
is against those that do those things.
3. Dost thou think—
thou that sittest in judgment on those who do such things
and dost them thyself—
that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?
4. Or, dost thou despise the wealth of His goodness,
and of His patience, and long-suffering;
while thou failest to see
that the goodness of God is urging thee on
to repentance?

(2) *The inevitable judgment of God.* II, 5-11

5. But, according to thy obduracy
and thy impenitent heart,
thou storest up for thyself wrath
in the Day of Wrath,
and of the manifestation of the just judging of God,
6. Who "will render to each one
according to his works"—
7. to those who, with patient devotion to good work,
seek glory, and honour, and immortality,
—eternal life;
8. but to men of self-seeking,
and to those who are rebellious to truth
but docile to injustice,
—anger and fury.
9. Tribulation and anguish
to every soul of man that does evil—
the Jew first, and the Greek too!

10. But glory, and honour, and peace
to everyone that does good—
the Jew first, and the Greek too !
11. For there is no partiality with God !

(3) *The Gentiles also have a Law of their own.* II, 12-16

12. For, all who have sinned without the [Mosaic] Law
shall perish, too, without (that) Law ;
and all who sin under the Law
will be judged by the Law ;
13. for it is not those who hear the Law read
that are just before God ;
but those who carry out the Law
shall be regarded as just
14. (Indeed, when the Gentiles who have not the Law
fulfil the precepts of the Law
at the instigation of nature,
though they have not the Law,
they are a Law to themselves !
15. For they show that what the Law prescribes
is written in their hearts ;
and thereto their conscience also testifies,—
and their thoughts as well,
which in turn accuse or excuse them.)
16. on the day when, according to my Gospel,
God will judge through Christ Jesus
the secret actions of men.

(4) *Jewish violation of the Law.* II, 17-24

17. But if thou callest thyself a Jew,
and leanest on the Law
and boastest about God,
18. and knowest the [divine] Will,
and, because thou art taught out of the Law,
canst discern the better things,
19. and art confident that thou art
the guide of the blind,
a light to those in darkness,
20. the instructor of the ignorant,
the teacher of children,
because thou hast in the Law
the standard of knowledge and truth,
21. thou, then, that teachest another,
dost thou not teach thyself ?
Thou that preachest not to steal,
dost thou steal ?

22. Thou that sayest there must not be adultery,
dost thou commit adultery ?
Thou that detestest idols,
dost thou rob temples ?
23. Thou that boastest of the Law—
dost thou dishonour God by violation of the Law ?
For, as it is written,
24. “ God’s name is blasphemed on your account
among the Gentiles.”

(5) *Circumcision, as such, no real advantage.* II, 25-29

25. Circumcision is indeed useful,
if thou fulfillest the Law.
But if thou art a transgressor of the Law,
thy circumcision has become non-circumcision.
26. If then one who is uncircumcised
observes the precepts of the Law,
shall not his non-circumcision
be reckoned as circumcision ?
27. The physically uncircumcised
who fulfills the Law
will judge thee,
who, with the letter and circumcision,
art a transgressor of the Law.
28. For the (real) Jew is not he
who is externally a Jew ;
Nor is the external circumcision in the flesh
the (true) circumcision ;
29. but he that is inwardly so
is a (real) Jew,
and the circumcision of the heart
through the spirit, not by the letter,
is the (true) circumcision ;
And the praise of such [a Jew]
is not from men,
but from God.

(6) *Jewish perfidy inexcusable. Objections answered.* III, 1-8

- III, 1. What is, then, the advantage of the Jew,
or what is the profit of circumcision ?
2. Much, in every way !
First of all because they were entrusted
with the oracles of God !

3. How then ?
If some of them have been disloyal (incredulous);
will their disloyalty (unbelief)
nullify the fidelity of God ?
4. Surely not !
God must be regarded as veracious ;
but every man is a liar,
as it is written :
"That Thou mayest be found just
in Thy words
and mayest triumph
when Thou art judged."
5. But if our injustice establishes
the justice of God,
what shall we say ?
Is God unjust when He gives free play
to His anger ?
I speak after human fashion !
6. Surely not !
For then how could God judge the world ?
7. But if the veracity of God appears all the greater
through my falsehood,
(and this is) unto His glory,
why am I still condemned as a Sinner ?
8. And why should we not say
(as some people calumniously represent us as teaching)
"Let us do evil that good may come" ?
Of such men the condemnation is just !

(7) *Scripture proof of Jewish corruption.* III, 9-20

9. What then ? Have we any advantage ?
Certainly not !
For we have brought indictment against Jews and Greeks
that all are in subjection to sin,
10. as it is written :
"There is not one just—not even one !"
11. "There is not one that has understanding,"
"Not one that seeks God ;
12. "All have gone astray ;
"one and all together they have become corrupted.
"There is not one that does good—not even one !
13. "Their throat is an open sepulchre :
"with their tongues they practise deceit.
"The poison of adders is beneath their lips.
14. "Their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness.

15. "Swift are their feet unto blood-shedding.
16. "Desolation and misery are on their paths ;
17. "and they know not the way of peace
18. "The fear of God is not before their eyes."
19. But we know that whatever the Law says,
it says to those who are under the Law ;
so that every mouth is shut,
and the whole world is liable to God's judgment,
20. because by works of the Law "no one is just before Him" ;
for through the Law (comes only) clear knowledge of sin.

II. THE CHRISTIAN WAY OF SALVATION. III, 21-IV, 25

a. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. III, 21-30

(1) *Faith in Jesus justifies.* III, 21-26

21. But now, out of all reference to the Law,
has been manifested the justice of God,
to which the Law and the Prophets bear witness—
22. that justice of God
which is (given) through faith in Jesus Christ
to all that believe.
For there is no distinction ;
23. for all have sinned,
and are lacking in the glory of God ;
24. but they are justified gratuitously
by His grace,
by means of the redemption which is in Christ Jesus,
25. Whom God has set forth
as a propitiatory sacrifice through the medium of faith,
in His blood,—
so as to make manifest His justice,
on account of the letting pass of former sins
26. in the period of God's patience ;
—so as to make manifest His justice [I say]
in the present time,
[and to show] that He Himself is just,
and that He justifies him
who has faith in Jesus.

(2) *Jewish boasting of works is futile.* III, 27-30

27. Where, then, is the boasting ?
It is shut out !
By what kind of a Law ? Is it a Law of works ?
No, but by a Law of faith.

28. For we hold that a man is justified by faith
without works of the Law!
29. Or is God God of the Jews only?
And not of the Gentiles too?
Yes, of the Gentiles too,
30. since there is but one God
Who will justify the circumcised as a result of faith,
and the uncircumcised by means of faith.

b. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

III, 31-IV, 25

(1) *Abraham justified by faith.* III, 31-IV, 8

31. Do we then overthrow the Law by faith?
Certainly not!
We rather confirm the Law.
- IV, 1. What then shall we say
“that Abraham, our ancestor according to the flesh, found?”
2. For if Abraham was justified by works,
he has [reason for] boasting—
But not against God,
3. for what does the Scripture say?
“Abraham believed God,
and it was reckoned to him unto justice.”
4. Now to him that works, wage is reckoned
not according to favour,
but according to obligation.
5. But to him that does not work,
but believes in Him that justifies the impious,
his faith is reckoned unto justice.
6. In this sense David declares the blessedness
of the man to whom God reckons justice without works:
7. “Blessed are they whose offences are remitted,
and whose sins are covered up.
8. Blessed is the man whose sin the Lord does not reckon.”

(2) *Abraham was justified while still uncircumcised.* IV, 9-12

9. Does this congratulation, then, refer to the circumcised,
or to the uncircumcised as well?
[Surely also to the uncircumcised]
for what we say is:
“Faith was reckoned to Abraham as justice.”

10. In what circumstances, then, was it [thus] reckoned ?
Was it when he was in [the state of] circumcision,
or uncircumcision ?
Not in [the state of] circumcision,
but in [the state of] uncircumcision ;
11. and the sign of circumcision he received
as a seal of the justification of faith
which [he had obtained] while still uncircumcised.
So that he is the father
of all who believe while uncircumcised
so that to them also justice should be reckoned ;
12. and that he might be the father of the circumcised
who are not only circumcised,
but walk in the footsteps of the faith
which our father Abraham had,
when he was still uncircumcised.

(3) *The promises made to Abraham and to his seed do not depend for their fulfilment on the Law ; they guarantee to all men justification by faith. IV, 13-17*

13. For not through the medium of the Law
did the promise reach Abraham or his seed,
that he would be the heir of the world,
but by means of the justice of faith.
14. For if they who are of the Law are heirs,
faith is made void,
and the promise is nullified.
15. For the Law produces wrath ;
for where there is no Law
there is no transgression.
16. Wherefore "Through Faith" [holds good]
that "According to grace" [may also hold good],
so that the promise is made secure
for the entire posterity,
not merely for that portion which is of the Law,
but for that also which is of the faith of Abraham,
who is the father of us all,
17. as it is written :
"I have made thee father of many nations"
[And that he is] before the face of God
Whom he believed,
Who makes the dead to live,
and calls into being what does not exist.

(4) *The intensity of Abraham's faith.* IV, 18-22

18. Now he [Abraham] against hope, yet full of hope, believed and so became the father of many nations in accordance with what was said :
"Thus shall be thy posterity !"
19. And he weakened not in faith when he considered his worn out body (for he was nearly a hundred years old) and the dead womb of Sara ;
20. in view of God's promise he doubted not with unbelief, but rather grew strong in faith, giving glory to God ;
21. and he was fully convinced that He [God] had the power to accomplish what He had promised.
22. Hence this "was reckoned to him unto justice."

(5) *The lesson of Abraham's faith applied to Christians.* IV, 23-25

23. But not merely for his sake, has it been written,
"It was reckoned unto him,"
24. but also for our sakes ;
for it will be reckoned to us also who believe in Him,
Who raised Jesus, Our Lord, from the dead,
25. Who was given up [to death] on account of our offences, and was raised up on account of our justification.

III. THE LIFE OF THE JUSTIFIED. V, 1-VI, 23

a. THE FRUITS OF JUSTIFICATION. V, 1-11

- V, 1. Now that we have been justified we have peace with God, through Our Lord, Jesus Christ ;
2. by Whom we have obtained through faith access to this grace in which we stand, and [by Whom] we boast, [resting on] the hope of the glory of God.
3. And not only this—
but we boast also in tribulations, knowing that tribulation produces endurance,
4. and endurance tested virtue, and tested virtue, hope.

5. Now hope does not bring to shame,
for God's love is poured out in our hearts
by the Holy Spirit, Who has been given to us.
6. For while we were still sick,
Christ, in due season, died for the impious.
7. Now one will scarcely die for a just man ;
for his benefactor, perhaps,
a man will be brave enough to die.
8. But God proves [clearly] His love for us in this
that, while we were still sinners,
Christ died for our sake.
9. With all the more reason, therefore, shall we,
now that we have been justified by His blood,
be saved by Him from wrath.
10. For, if, when we were enemies,
we were reconciled with God,
by the death of His Son,
so shall we, thus reconciled,
with all the more reason, be saved by His life.
11. And not merely this—
but we boast also of God,
through Our Lord Jesus Christ,
by Whom we have now attained reconciliation.

b. PARALLEL BETWEEN CHRIST AND ADAM. V, 12-21

(1) *Resemblance between the deed of Adam and the work of Christ.*
V, 12-14

12. As, therefore, through one man
sin entered into the world,
and by sin death,
and so death passed on to all men,
because all (had) sinned.—
13. For up to the Law
sin was in the world ;
but sin was not imputed
in the absence of law.
14. Yet Death reigned
from Adam to Moses
even over those
who did not sin after the manner of the transgression of
Adam,—
who was a type of the future [Adam].

(2) *Differences between the work of Adam and that of Christ.* V, 15-17

15. But not as it was with the transgression
is it with the gift of grace.
For if, through the transgression of one
the many have died,
So, all the more,
have the grace of God,
and the gift in the grace of the one man,
Jesus Christ,
superabounded unto the many.
16. And with the gift it is not
as with the outcome of the deed
of the one man who sinned :
for the judgment proceeded from one man
unto condemnation ;
but the gracious gift proceeds from many transgressions
unto justification.
17. For if, through the transgression of one,
Death reigned through that one,
So will they,
who have received
the superabundance of grace,
and of the gift of justification,
all the more reign in life,
through the One Jesus Christ !

(3) *Summary of Parallel.* V, 18-21

18. As, then, through one transgression
it has come to condemnation for all men,
so also through one justifying
it comes to justification leading to life for all men.
19. For, as through the disobedience of one man
the many were made sinners,
so through the obedience of One
the many shall be made just.
20. The Law came in
that transgression might abound ;
but where sin abounded
grace has, all the more, superabounded :
21. So that, as sin reigned by death,
so also grace may reign through justice
unto eternal life,
through Jesus Christ, Our Lord.

c. NO PLACE FOR SIN IN THE LIFE OF THE JUSTIFIED. VI, 1-23

(1) *Dying with Christ in Baptism.* VI, 1-7

- VI, 1. What then shall we say ?
Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound ?
2. Surely not !
Since we have died to Sin,
how shall we still live therein ?
3. Or do ye not know
that all of us who have been baptised unto Christ Jesus
have been baptised unto His death ?
4. We were, then, buried together with Him
through Baptism unto death,
so that, as Christ was raised up from the dead
through the glory of the Father,
we also may walk in a new life.
5. For, if we have been blended with Him
through a death like His,
so shall we [be blended with Him]
through a resurrection [like His].
6. For we know this,
that our "old man" was crucified with [Him]
that the body of Sin might be destroyed,
so that we should no longer do slave-service to Sin.
7. For he that is dead is justified from Sin.

(2) *Sinless life with Christ.* VI, 8-14

8. If we have died with Christ.
We believe that we shall also live with Him.
9. For we know that Christ,
Who was raised up from the dead,
dies no more :
death has no longer lordship over Him.
10. For, as for His dying,
He died to Sin once for all :
but, as for His living,
He lives unto God.
11. Regard yourselves thus—ye also,
as dead for Sin,
but as living for God in Christ Jesus.
12. Let not Sin, then, reign in your mortal body
so that ye should obey its lusts.

13. And offer not your members to Sin as weapons of injustice ;
but offer yourselves to God
as men living from among the dead,
and (offer) your members to God
as weapons of justice.
14. For Sin will not lord it over you,
because ye are no longer under the Law,
but under grace.

(3) *Service of Justice has replaced the slave-service of Sin.* VI, 15-23

15. What then !
Shall we sin
because we are not under the Law,
but under Grace ?
Surely not !
16. Do ye not know
that, when ye offer yourselves to some one
as slaves unto obedience,
ye are slaves of him whom ye obey—
whether it is (slaves) of Sin
unto death,
or (slaves) of obedience
unto justice ?
17. But thanks be to God
that, (whereas) ye were slaves of Sin,
(yet now) ye have come to obey from your hearts
that form of teaching
according to which ye were taught !
18. Set free from Sin
ye were made slaves unto justice.
19. I speak in human fashion
because of the weakness of your flesh.
For, as ye (formerly) offered your members as slaves
to impurity and lawlessness
unto lawlessness,
so now offer your members as slaves
to justice
unto holiness !
20. For when ye were slaves of Sin
ye were free in regard to justice.
21. What advantage had ye then from the things
of which ye now are ashamed ?
[None !]

22. For the end of those things is death !
But now, set free from Sin,
but enslaved to God,
ye have your advantage
unto holiness,
and, as the end, eternal life !
23. For the wages of Sin is death ;
but the gracious gift of God is Eternal Life
in Christ Jesus, Our Lord !

IV. THE NEW FORCES AT WORK IN CHRISTIANITY.

VII, 1-VIII, 39

a. CHRISTIANITY HAS ABOLISHED THE SLAVERY OF THE MOSAIC LAW.

VII, 1-25

(1) *The Law cannot bind the Christian.* VII, 1-6

- VII, 1. Or know ye not brethren—
For I speak to such as know the Law—
that the Law lords it over a man
as long as he lives ?
2. For the married woman, is bound by the Law
to her living husband ;
but if the husband die,
she is free from the Law concerning the husband.
 3. Hence she will be called an adulteress
if, while her husband lives,
she gives herself to another man.
But if her husband die,
she is free from the Law [of the husband]
so that she will not be an adulteress
if she gives herself to another man !
 4. So my brethren ye, too, are dead to the Law
through the body of Christ,
So that ye belong to Another,—
to Him that was raised up from the dead—
that we may bring forth fruit for God !
 5. For when we were (still) in the flesh,
the passions that lead to Sin,
which were (roused) by the Law,
were active in our members,
so that we brought forth fruit for death.
 6. But now we have been released from the Law
through dying to that in which we were held captives,
so that we may serve in a new spirit,
and not in the old letter.

(2) *The Law as leading the Jews to Sin.* VII, 7-13

7. What then shall we say ?
Is the Law Sin ?
Surely not !
But I should not have known Sin
except through the Law !
For I should not have known concupiscence
if the Law did not say,
“Thou shalt not covet !”
8. When Sin had seized the opportunity
it wrought in me by means of the Commandment
every sort of desire.
For without Law Sin is dead !
9. I lived (once) without Law.
But when the Commandment came
Sin took life,
10. but I died ;
and the Commandment,
which was intended for life,
was found, in my case,
to be unto death.
11. For when Sin had seized on the opportunity,
it led me astray by means of the Commandment,
and slew me thereby.
12. So that the Law is holy,
and the Commandment is holy, and just, and good !
13. Has, then, that which is good
become death to me ?
Surely not !
[Not that which is good] but Sin—
that it might be manifest as Sin—
wrought death for me
by that which is good :
so that Sin might be sinful beyond measure
through the Commandment.

(3) *Those under the Law were powerless against Sin.* VII, 14-25

14. We know that the Law is spiritual :
but I am carnal—
sold into the power of Sin.
15. For what I do I understand not :
for not what I will do I perform,
but what I abominate that I do.
16. But when I do what I will not
I concur with the Law,
(and recognise) that it is good.

17. I then do not perform the act,
but the Sin that dwells in me.
18. For I know that nothing good dwells in me—
that is, in my flesh.
For willing lies ready at hand for me,
but the performance of the good deed does not!
19. For I do not the good that I will,
but the evil which I will not—that I do.
20. But if I do that which I will not,
it is not I that do it,
but the Sin that dwells in me.
21. I find this law, then, present,
that, when I will to do good,
evil lies ready to hand.
22. For I have pleasure in the Law
according to the inner man :
23. but I see another law in my members
that goes forth to do battle with the law of my mind,
and takes me captive
in the law of Sin that is in my members.
24. Wretched man that I am !
Who will rescue me from the body of this death ?
25. Thanks be to God—through Jesus Christ, Our Lord !
And so I serve with the mind
the Law of God ;
but with my flesh
(I serve) the law of Sin !

b. THE SPIRITUAL LIFE OF CHRISTIANS. VIII, 1–39

(1) *The Christian as subject to the "Law of the Spirit."* VIII, 1–4

- VIII, 1. There is now therefore no condemnation
for those that are in Christ Jesus,
2. For the law of the Spirit of life
in Christ Jesus
has set thee free
from the law of Sin and death.
 3. For that which for the Law was impossible
—because it was weak through the flesh—
[has become possible] ;
God sent His own Son
in flesh like the flesh of Sin,
and on account of Sin,
and condemned in the flesh Sin,

4. so that the ordinance of the Law
might be carried out in us
while we walk, not according to the flesh,
but according to the Spirit.

(2) *Contrast between the carnal and the spiritual.* VIII, 5-8

5. For those who are according to the flesh
set their minds on things of the flesh,
but those who are according to the Spirit,
on the things of the Spirit.
6. For the bent of the flesh
is death :
but the bent of the spirit
is life and peace.
7. The bent of the flesh is indeed enmity to God,
for it does not subject itself to the Law of God ;
nor can it do so !
8. For those who are in the flesh cannot please God.

(3) *The Spirit of God dwells in the Christian.* VIII, 9-13

9. But ye are not in the flesh
but in the Spirit,
if [it is true, as it is, that] the Spirit of God
dwells in you.
But if anyone has not the Spirit of Christ,
he does not belong to Him.
10. But if Christ is in you,
the body is dead because of sin,
but the spirit is life
on account of justice.
11. If the Spirit of Him that raised Jesus from the dead
dwells in you,
He that raised Christ Jesus from the dead
will quicken your mortal bodies also
by His Spirit that dwells in you.
12. Hence, brethren, we are under obligation,
not to the flesh,
to live according to the flesh,
[but to the Spirit,
to live according to the Spirit]
13. For if ye live according to the flesh,
ye shall die :
but if by the Spirit ye slay the [evil] doings of the body,
ye shall live.

(4) *Those who have the Spirit are children and heirs of God.*

VIII, 14-17

14. For all who let themselves be led
by the Spirit of God,
are sons of God.
15. For the Spirit which ye have received
is not a spirit of bondage, back unto fear ;
but ye have received a spirit of Sonship
in which we cry, "Abba ! Father !"
16. The Spirit Himself testifies along with our spirit
that we are God's children.
17. But if [we are] children
Then [are we] also heirs—
heirs of God, coheirs with Christ—
if [as is true] we suffer with [Christ]
so that we may be glorified with [Him].

(5) *The longing of Nature and of Christians for the glory of the Elect.*

VIII, 18-25

18. For I hold that the sufferings of the present
are of no importance
in comparison with the glory
which is to be shown forth in us !
19. For the anxious longing of creation
awaits eagerly the manifestation of the Sons of God.
20. For creation was made subject to vanity,
not willingly,
but for the sake of Him
who subjected it in hope ;
21. because creation itself was to be delivered
from the slavery of corruption,
[and attain] to the freedom of the glory
of the children of God.
22. For we know that all creation
groans together,
and is in travail together,
up to the present.
23. And not only [creation],
but we also,
who have the first fruits of the Spirit—
we too groan in ourselves
waiting for Sonship—the redemption of our bodies.

24. For, as to hope, we are saved !
But a hope which one can see
is not a hope.
For how can a man hope
for what he beholds ?
25. But if we hope for that which we behold not,
we await it with patience !

(6) *The help of the Holy Spirit in prayer.* VIII, 26-27

26. In like fashion, also, the Spirit
takes us in hand in our weakness.
For we know not
how we should pray as is right.
But the Spirit Himself intercedes for us
with unspeakable groanings.
27. But He that searches hearts
knows what is the purpose of the Spirit,
(and) that He intercedes for the Saints
according to God.

(7) *The Divine call to Salvation.* VIII, 28-30

28. Now we know
that for those who love God
everything cooperates towards good,
because they are those who are called
according to [God's] decree.
29. For those whom He foreapproved
and foredestined to be like unto the image of His Son,
that He might be the first-born among many brethren—
30. those whom He predestined
He also called,
and those whom He called
He also justified,
and those whom He justified
He also glorified !

(8) *A Hymn of praise inspired by confident hope of Salvation.*

VIII, 31-39

31. What now shall we say to this ?
If God is for us,
who will be against us ?
32. He that spared not His own Son,
but gave Him up [to death] for us all—
why should He not give us
all [other] things with Him ?

33. Who shall bring a charge
against the chosen ones of God ?
God—who justifies ?
34. Who is it that shall condemn ?
Christ Jesus—Who died,
still more, Who was raised up ;
Who is at the right hand of God,
Who also intercedes for us ?
35. Who will sever us from the love of Christ ?
Sorrow, or affliction,
or persecution, or hunger, or nakedness,
or danger, or the sword ?
36. As it is written :
“ For Thy sake we are being slain the whole day ;
We are reckoned as sheep destined for slaughter.”
37. But in all these things
we more than triumph
through Him Who has loved us.
38. For I am convinced
that neither Death, nor Life,
neither Angels, nor Principalities,
neither the Present, nor the Future,
neither Powers,
39. nor Height, nor Depth,
nor any other creature,
can sever us from the love of God,
which is in Christ Jesus, Our Lord !

V. GOD'S PROVIDENCE TOWARDS ISRAEL. IX, 1-XI, 36

a. THE FREEDOM OF DIVINE ELECTION. IX, 1-29

(1) *Paul's grief at the rejection of the Chosen People.* IX, 1-5

- IX, 1. I speak in Christ the truth,
I lie not,
and my conscience gives testimony for me
in the Holy Spirit,
2. that I have great grief
and (there is) unceasing pain in my heart.
3. I could wish, as far as I am concerned,
to be accursed—(put away) from Christ
for the sake of my brethren,
my kinsmen according to the flesh !—

4. For they are Israelites,
and to them belong, the adoption of sons
and the Glory,
and the Covenants,
and the Legislation,
and the (Temple) Worship,
and the Promises :
5. and to them belong the Patriarchs,
and from them is Christ,
according to the flesh—
Who is God above all,
praised for ever. Amen.

(2) *Not all Israelites belong to the spiritual "Israel" for which (and not for the Israel of the flesh) the promises were intended. IX, 6-13*

6. Not as though the word of God had failed !
For not all who are of Israel
are Israelites :
7. nor, because they are the Seed of Abraham,
are they all (his) children.
Rather, [is it true],
"In Isaac will posterity be named for thee."
8. That means :
Not the children of the flesh
are children of God ;
but the children of the Promise
are regarded as the [genuine] posterity.
9. For of the promise this is the word :
"At this time I will return
and Sara will have a Son."
10. And not merely [Sara],
but Rebecca too,
who from one conceived,—
from Isaac our father,
[bore two sons towards whom God's attitude varied].
11. For before they were born,
or had done aught that was good or evil—
that the design of God,
which was according to free election,
should stand,
12. [depending] not on works,
but on Him Who gives the call—
it was said to her :
"The elder will be slave to the younger !"

13. As it is (elsewhere) written :
 "I loved Jacob,
 but I hated Esau ! "

(3) *In choosing and rejecting, God is not unjust.* IX, 14-23

14. What shall we say now ?
 Is there injustice in God ?
 Surely not !
15. For He says to Moses :
 " I will have mercy on him
 on whom I shall have mercy ;
 and I will have pity on him
 whom I shall pity ! "
16. Hence it [all] depends
 not on him that wills,
 nor on him that runs,
 but on God Who shows mercy !
17. For the Scripture says to Pharaoh :
 " Unto this have I spurred thee on
 that I should show my power in thee,
 and that my Name might be proclaimed
 throughout the whole earth ! "
18. Hence He shows mercy to whom He pleases,
 and He hardens whomsoever He wills.
19. You will say to me, therefore :
 " Why does He still upbraid ?
 Who opposes His will ? "
20. But O man who art thou
 to gainsay God ?
 Will that which is fashioned
 say to Him that fashioned it :
 " Why hast Thou made me Thus ? "
21. Or has not the Potter power over the clay
 to make from the same mass
 vessels for honour,
 and vessels for dishonour ?
22. Now if God,
 wishing to show His anger,
 and display His power,
 has endured with much forbearance
 vessels of wrath ripe for destruction,
23. so as to make known the wealth of His glory
 in vessels of mercy
 which He prefashioned for glory,
 [What can be objected to this ?]

(4) *The elect are chosen from among the Gentiles and the "Remnant" of Israel.* IX, 24-29

24. As such He has called
even us—
not merely out of the Jews,
but out of the Gentiles.
25. As He says in [the Book of] Osee :
I will call "Not-my-people,"
"My-people,"
and "Not-beloved" (I will call)
"Beloved."
26. And in the place where was said to them,
"Ye are not my people"
they shall be called,
the sons of the Living God !
27. But Isaias cries out regarding Israel :
"Even if the number of the Israelites
were as the sand of the sea,
yet (only) a remnant will be saved ;
28. for fully and swiftly
shall the Lord execute a sentence on earth."
29. And, as Isaias also prophesied :
"If the Lord had not left us a seed,
we should have been as Sodom,
and we should have been made like to Gomorrah !"

b. THE GUILT OF UNBELIEVING ISRAEL. IX, 30-X, 21

(1) *The Jews have stumbled on the "Stone of Stumbling."* IX, 30-33

30. What shall we say then ?
[This]—that the Gentiles,
who did not strive after justice,
attained unto justice,—
the justice, that is, of faith ;
31. but Israel,
though it strove after the Law of justice,
did not attain unto the Law.
32. Why ?
Because [it strove after justice],—
not that which is of faith,
but—as it thought—
through works.
They stumbled on the Stone of Stumbling,

33. as it is written,
 "Look ! I set in Sion
 a stone for stumbling
 and a rock for tripping over :
 and he that trusts therein
 will not be brought to shame !"

(2) *The Jews have failed to grasp the notion of justification by faith.*
 X, 1-13

- X. 1. Brethren,
 the wish of my heart, and the prayer
 are unto God, on their behalf,
 for salvation.
2. For I bear testimony to them,
 that they have zeal for God,
 but not an intelligent zeal !
3. For while they failed to comprehend
 the justice of God,
 and sought to establish
 a justice of their own,
 they refused to subject themselves
 to the justice of God.
4. For the end of the Law is Christ—
 unto justice for everyone that believes.
5. Moses writes about the justice
 which is of the Law,
 "The man who does these things
 will live by it !"
6. But the justice which is of faith speaks thus :
 "Say not in thy heart :
 "Who will ascend into heaven ?"
 —that is, to fetch down Christ !
7. or, "Who will go down into the Underworld ?"
 —that is, to bring Christ up from the dead !
8. But what does it say ?
 "Near to thee is the Word,
 in thy mouth
 and in thy heart"—
 the Word of faith, that is,
 which we proclaim.
9. For if thou dost confess with thy mouth
 that Jesus is Lord,
 and dost believe with thy heart
 that God raised Him from the dead,
 thou shalt be saved.

10. For with the heart
one believes unto justice,
and with the mouth
one makes confession unto salvation.
11. For the Scripture says :
"None that trusts in Him
shall be brought to shame !"
12. For there is no distinction
between Jew and Greek.
For One and the Same
is the Lord of All,
rich for all who invoke Him.
13. For "everyone that invokes the Name of the Lord
will be saved."

(3) *The Jews have rejected the message of faith.* X, 14-17

14. But how shall men invoke One
in Whom they have not come to believe ?
And how shall they believe One
of Whom they had not heard ?
And how shall they hear
without a Preacher ?
15. And how shall they [the Preachers] make announcement,
if they are not sent ?
As it is written :
"How lovely are the feet of those
that proclaim good tidings !"
16. But not all have obeyed the Gospel.
For Isaias says :
"Lord, who has hearkened to our message ?"
17. Faith, then, (comes) from hearing,
and hearing is through the word of Christ.

(4) *Jewish unbelief is inexcusable.* X, 18-21

18. But, I ask, have they not heard ?
Indeed, "unto all the earth
has their sound gone forth,
and to the ends of the world
their words [have gone]."
19. But I ask :
Has Israel not understood ?
Moses, in his far-off day, says :
"I will make you jealous
of a Non-people :
I will rouse you to anger
about a foolish people."

20. And Isaias is daring and says :
 "I let myself be found
 by them that sought me not :
 I manifested myself to them
 that asked no oracle of me."
21. But concerning Israel he says :
 "The live-long day I spread out my hands
 towards a people incredulous and rebellious!"

c. ISRAEL HAS NOT BEEN COMPLETELY REJECTED. XI, 1-36

(1) *God has chosen a "remnant" of believers from among the Jews.*

XI, 1-6

- XI, 1. I say, then :
 Can it be that God has rejected His people ?
 Surely not !
 For I am an Israelite
 of the seed of Abraham
 of the tribe of Benjamin.
2. God has not rejected His people
 which He foreknew.
 Or do ye not know what the Scripture says
 in [the story of] Elias,
 how he [Elias] complains to God
 against Israel :
 3. "Lord, they have slain Thy prophets ;
 they have pulled down Thy altars ;
 and I alone am left,
 and they are seeking my life !"
 4. But what does the (divine) oracle say to him ?
 "I have left for myself seven thousand men
 that have not bent the knee to Baal !"
 5. So, similarly, in the present time
 there is a "remnant"
 corresponding to the gracious choice [of God].
 6. But if [its election] is by grace,
 then not from works ;
 for otherwise grace would no longer be grace.

(2) *The remainder of the Jews have been "hardened."* XI, 7-10

7. What then ?
 Has not Israel attained
 what it strove after ?
 The chosen section has attained it ;
 but the others have become obdurate,

8. as it is written :
 "God has given them a spirit of lethargy—
 eyes that see not,
 and ears that hear not,
 up to this very day!"
9. And David says :
 "Their table shall be for them
 a snare, and a gin, and a stumbling-block
 and a means of retribution.
10. Let their eyes be dimmed
 so that they see not ;
 and make thou their backs bend for ever!"

(3) *The rejection of Israel helps to hasten the Conversion of the Gentiles.* XI, 11-15

11. I ask, then :
 Have they stumbled so as to fall [utterly] ?
 Surely not !
 Rather, through their transgression
 salvation has reached the Gentiles,
 so as to make them [the Jews] jealous.
12. But if their transgression
 is the wealth of the world,
 and their failure
 is the wealth of the Gentiles,
 by how much more will their full conversion
 [be the wealth of the world] ?
13. But to you, Gentiles, I say :
 Just because I am an Apostle to the Gentiles
 I do (all) honour to my office
14. with a view to rousing to jealousy
 my own flesh (= people),
 and thus saving some of them.
15. For if their rejection
 is the reconciliation of the world,
 what will their restoration to favour be,
 but life from the dead ?

(4) *Judaism as the fertile Olive on which the Gentile Christians have been engrafted as shoots of wild olive.* XI, 16-24

16. For if the first fruits are holy,
 so also is the (entire) mass :
 and if the root is holy,
 so also are the branches.

17. But if some of the branches have been broken off,
and thou, a wild shoot, hast been engrafted among them,
and hast come to share
in the fat root of the olive-tree,
18. then boast not over the branches—
[that have been broken off].
But if thou boastest
[remember] that thou supportest not the root,
but the root supports thee !
19. Thou wilt then say :
“ The branches were broken off
that I might be engrafted ! ”
20. Yes indeed !
They were broken off
because of unbelief ;
but thou standest
because of faith !
Be not of arrogant mind,
but be afraid.
21. For if God spared not the natural branches,
neither will He spare thee.
22. See, then, the Kindness and the Severity of God !
Towards the fallen away, the Severity,
but towards thee, the Kindness of God—
if indeed thou abidest in (that) Kindness,
for [otherwise] thou too wilt be lopped off !
23. And they, too, if they persist not in unbelief,
will be engrafted :
for God is mighty (enough)
to engraft them again !
24. For if thou wert cut off
from that which is by nature a wild olive,
and hast been engrafted against thy nature
on the genuine olive-tree,
how much more certainly will the natural [branches of
the fruitful olive]
be engrafted on their own olive-tree ?

(5) *All Israel will ultimately be saved.* XI, 25-32

25. For I do not wish
that ye should be unaware, brethren,
of this mystery—
that ye may not be wise in your own eyes—
that obduracy has come upon a section of Israel
until the totality of the Gentiles shall enter in,

26. and then all Israel will be saved,
as is written :
"From Sion will come the Rescuer ;
He will put away wickedness from Jacob :
27. And that will be for them my Covenant—
that I will take away their sins."
28. In regard to the Gospel
they are enemies [of God]
for your sake [—for the advantage of the Gentiles] ;
but in regard to election
they are beloved [of God]
for the sake of the Fathers.
29. For irrevocable are the gracious gifts
and the Calling of God.
30. For, as ye once were disobedient to God,
but have now found grace
because of the disobedience of those [the incredulous Jews],
31. so those also who have now become disobedient
may also,
because of your receiving mercy,
now find mercy.
32. For God has shut up all in disobedience
that He may show mercy to all !

(6) *Praise of Divine Wisdom.* XI, 33-36

33. O abyss of the wealth,
and the Wisdom,
and the Knowledge
of God !
How unsearchable are His judgments !
And how untraceable His ways !
34. For who has known the mind of God,
and who has been His counsellor ?
35. Or who has given Him aught
that requital should be made therefor ?
36. For from Him, and through Him, and unto Him
are all things !
To Him be glory for evermore !
Amen !

B. MORAL SECTION

MORAL DUTIES OF CHRISTIANS. XII, 1-XV, 13

a. GENERAL DUTIES OF CHRISTIANS. XII, 1-XIII, 14

- (1) *The Christian Life as a Sacrifice offered to God, and a transformation of Soul.* XII, 1-2

XII, 1. I exhort you, brethren,
 by the mercy of God
 to present your bodies
 as a sacrifice
 living, holy, God-pleasing—
 your reasonable worship ;
 2. and fashion yourselves not according to this world,
 but transform yourselves
 by constant renewal of mind,
 so that ye may discern
 what the will of God is—
 the thing that is good, and well-pleasing, and perfect !

- (2) *Need of a proper estimate of self and of others.* XII, 3-8

3. Through the grace that has been given to me
 I say to each one of you
 not to think more highly of himself
 than he ought to think,
 but to think with due moderation—
 each one according as God has given to him
 the measure of faith.
4. For, as we have many members in one body,
 but not all the members have the same function,
5. so we are all one body in Christ,
 but individually we are members of one another.
6. But as we have gifts which are different
 according to the grace given to us—
 whether Prophecy,—[then let it be exercised]
 according to the measure of faith ;
7. or ministering—[then let it be]
 in ministering ;
 whether it is that one teaches—(let him be active)
 in teaching ;

8. or that one exhorts—(let him be active)
in exhortation.
He that gives alms (let him do so)
in single-mindedness.
Whoever presides (let him do so)
with zeal :
Whoever exercises mercy (let him do it)
with cheerfulness.

(4) *Exercise of fraternal charity.* XII, 9-21

9. Let charity be free from pretence.
Be ye such as detest what is evil,
and cling to what is good ;
10. in brotherly love (be ye) tender to one another,
anticipating one another in (showing) respect ;
11. slacking not in zeal,
ardent in spirit,
serving the Lord,
12. joyful in hope,
patient in trouble,
13. persevering in prayer,
helping to meet the needs of the Saints,
diligent in hospitality.
14. Bless those that persecute (you) ;
bless them, and curse them not !
15. Rejoice with those who rejoice ;
Weep with those who weep.
16. Be of one mind among yourselves,
Aim not too high,
but occupy yourselves with lowly services !
“ Be not wise in your own eyes ! ”
17. Requite no one with evil for evil.
Make what is good your aim in regard to all men.
18. If it is possible—so far as it depends on you—
be at peace with all men.
19. Avenge not yourselves, beloved,
but leave room for [God's] wrath ;
for it is written :
“ Mine is vengeance :
I will make requital,
says the Lord.”
20. Rather,
if thy enemy is hungry, feed him ;
if he is thirsty, give him to drink ;
for if thou dost this,
thou wilt heap burning coals on his head ! ”

21. Let not thyself be conquered by evil,
but conquer evil by goodness !

(4) *Duties towards established civil authority.* XIII, 1–7

- XIII, 1. Every soul should subject itself
to the ruling powers,
for there is no power
except from God.
Those that exist
have been established by God.
2. Hence whoever revolts against authority
sets himself against God's ordinance ;
they that set themselves (against it)
will bring condemnation on themselves.
3. For rulers are no object of dread
for good deeds,
but for evil.
If thou wilt, therefore, have no dread of authority,
do what is good,
and then thou shalt receive praise from it [authority],
4. for it is God's minister for thee
unto (thy) advantage.
But if thou dost evil,
then fear ;
for it [authority] carries not the sword in vain,
since it is God's minister,
an Avenger unto [the dispensing of God's] wrath
to him that does evil.
5. Hence one must subject oneself
not merely because of (God's) wrath,
but also for the sake of conscience.
6. Because of this, too, ye pay taxes,
for they [in authority] are God's officials,
completely taken up with this (office).
7. Give to them all what is due to them :
To [him that demands] tax, give tax ;
to [him that demands] custom, give custom ;
to [him that demands] fear, give fear ;
to [him that demands] honour, give honour.

(5) *Importance of fraternal charity.* XIII, 8–10

8. Be debtor, to no man in aught—
except only in regard to mutual love !
For he that loves his neighbour
has fulfilled the Law.

9. For, "Thou shalt not commit adultery,"
 "Thou shalt not kill,"
 "Thou shalt not steal,"
 "Thou shalt not covet,"
 and whatever other Commandments there are,
 are summed up in the word :
 "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."
10. Charity does no evil to the neighbour.
 Charity, then, is the fulfilment of the Law.

(6) *The critical needs of the time.* XIII, 11-14

11. And this [ye ought all the more to observe],
 because ye know the time [in which we live]—
 that it is now the time for you to awaken from sleep ;
 for salvation is nearer to us now
 than when we became believers.
12. The Night is well on ;
 the Day is close at hand.
 Let us, then, put off the works of darkness,
 and put on the weapons of light.
13. Let us, as if it were day, deport ourselves honourably,—
 not in luxurious banquets and drinking bouts,
 not in couches and debauch,
 not in quarrelling and jealousy !
14. Rather put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ ;
 and take not such care for the flesh,
 (as would give rise) to evil desire.

b. THE "WEAK" AND THE "STRONG." XIV, 1-XV, 13

(1) *Judge not thy brother.* XIV, 1-12

- XIV, 1. Take ye up him that is weak in faith,
 but not unto discussions and wranglings.
2. One man is convinced that he may eat anything ;
 but he that is weak eats only vegetables.
 3. He that eats must not despise
 him that eats not ;
 and he that eats not
 must not judge him that eats,
 for God has accepted him !
 4. Who art thou
 that judgest the servant of Another ?
 By his own Master he stands or falls.
 But he will stand,
 for the Lord has power to sustain him !

5. One man esteems one day above another ;
another man esteems all days alike.
Let each one be fully convinced in his own mind !
6. He that values a particular day,
does so for the Lord.
And he that eats,
eats for the Lord,
since he gives thanks to God.
And he that eats not,
eats not for the Lord,
and gives thanks to God.
7. For none of us lives for himself,
and none (of us) dies for himself.
8. For if we live,
we live for the Lord.
And if we die,
we die for the Lord.
Whether, then, we live or die,
we belong to the Lord !
9. For Christ died and lived again
that He might be Lord
over the dead and the living (alike).
10. But thou—
why dost thou judge thy brother ?
Or thou—
why dost thou despise thy brother ?
For we must all present ourselves
before the judgment-seat of God.
11. For it is written :
“ As I live, says the Lord,
every knee shall bend to Me,
and every tongue will praise God ! ”
12. Each one of us, then,
will have to give an account of himself to God.

(2) *Scandalise not thy brother.* XIV, 13-23

13. Let us, then, not judge one another ;
but rather resolve on this—
not to set for the brother
a stumbling-block, or scandal.
14. I know and am convinced in Jesus Christ
that there is nothing unclean in itself :
only for him that considers it unclean
is a thing unclean.

15. For if a brother is made to grieve
because of (thy) food,
thou no longer walkest according to charity.
Destroy not by thy food
him for whom Christ died !
16. Let not, then, your blessings
be reviled.
17. For the Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking,
but justice, and peace,
and joy in the Holy Spirit.
18. For he that serves Christ in this fashion
is pleasing to God,
and trustworthy in men's sight.
19. Let us then strive after peace,
and after the building up of one another.
20. Do not, for the sake of a food,
destroy the work of God !
"All things are indeed clean,"
but a thing is evil to a man
when he eats so as to cause offence.
21. It is a good thing
not to eat meat,
nor to drink wine,
nor to do aught whereby thy brother is brought to
stumbling.
22. The conviction which thou hast,
keep for thyself before God.
He is a lucky man
who does not condemn himself
in that which he decides (to do).
23. But he that doubts when he eats
is condemned,
because it is not according to conviction !
For what is not of conviction
is a sin.

(3) *Be considerate and tolerant towards all !* XV, 1-6

- XV, 1. We, the strong, must endure the infirmities of the weak,
and not please ourselves.
2. Each one of us ought to please his neighbour
unto goodness, for the sake of building up.
3. For Christ did not please Himself,
but, as is written :
"The insults of those that reviled Thee
have fallen on me."

4. For everything that was written of old
was written for our instruction,
so that, through the patience and the consolation
which the Scriptures give,
we may have hope.
5. May the God of patience and consolation
give to you
to be of one mind among yourselves
after the model of Christ Jesus,
6. so that, united in mind
and with one mouth,
ye may praise
God and the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

(4) *God wishes that Jews and Gentiles should glorify Him by their conversion.* XV, 7-13

7. Wherefore, interest yourselves in one another,
as Christ has interested Himself in us,
unto the glory of God.
8. I mean, that is,
that Christ has become the Servant of Circumcision
for the sake of the truth of God,
so as to confirm the promises made to the Fathers,
9. and that the Gentiles might glorify God
on account of mercy,
as it is written :
“Therefore I will praise Thee among the Gentiles,
and hymn unto Thy Name.”
10. And again it [Scripture] says :
“Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with His people !”
11. And again :
“Praise the Lord all ye Gentiles !
And let all the peoples extol Him !”
12. And again Isaias says :
“There will be the root of Jesse,
and He that arises to rule the Gentiles—
in Him the Gentiles will hope.”
13. May the God of hope fill you with all hope and peace
through your believing,
so that ye may richly abound in hope
through the power of the Holy Spirit.

EPILOGUE. XV, 14-XVI, 27

(1) *Paul has written daringly as Apostle of the Gentiles.* XV, 14-16

14. But I, brethren, on my part, am convinced
that ye also are full of kindly feeling,
filled, as ye are, with every kind of knowledge,
and capable of exhorting one another.
15. I have written to you in a certain degree
rather daringly,
[but I have done so merely]
to refresh your memory,
in view of that grace,
which was given to me by God,
16. that I might be the servant of Christ Jesus
unto the Gentiles,
dealing in priestly fashion with the Gospel of God,
that the offering of the Gentiles may be acceptable,
made holy [as it is] by the Holy Spirit.

(2) *Paul can boast in Christ of the work which he has accomplished.*
XV, 17-21

17. I have, then, the right to boast in Christ Jesus
in regard to the things [I have done] for God.
18. For I will not be so daring,
as to speak of anything
that Christ has not wrought through me
unto the submission of the Gentiles,
in word and deed,
19. in the power of signs and wonders,
in the power of the Holy Spirit,
so that from Jerusalem
round about as far as Illyricum
I have brought to completion
[the preaching of]
the Gospel of Christ.
20. And it has been a point of honour with me
not to preach the Gospel
where Christ has been already announced,
so that I might not build
upon another's foundation,
21. but that, as it is written,
"Those who had received no message about Him
should see,
and those who had heard nothing [of Him]
should understand!"

(3) *Paul's immediate Missionary Programme.* XV, 22-33

22. For that reason I have often been prevented
from coming to you.
23. But now that I have no place left
in these districts,
and because for many years I have been longing
to come to you, [I shall come]
24. whenever I set out for Spain.
For I hope to see you
as I pass through,
and to be sped forward on my journey
by you
when I shall have enjoyed for a while
the pleasure of your society.
25. At the moment I am setting out
for Jerusalem
in the service of the Saints.
26. For Macedonia and Achaia have decided
to make a collection for the poor
who are among the Saints at Jerusalem.
27. This was their decision,
and indeed they are indebted to them,
for if the Gentiles have attained to a share
in their spiritual possessions,
they, on their part, are bound to minister to them
with their earthly possessions.
28. As soon as I have carried this matter through,
and have sealed unto them this fruit,
I shall set off for Spain,
taking you on the way.
29. I know that when I do come to you,
I shall come with the fulness of Christ's blessing.
30. I exhort you, Brethren,
by Our Lord Jesus Christ,
and by the love of the Spirit,
to unite in struggle with me
by your prayers to God on my behalf,
31. that I may be rescued
from the unbelievers in Judæa,
and that my mission of service to Jerusalem
may be well received by the Saints,
32. so that I may come to you in joy,
when God wills,
and refresh myself with you !
33. The God of Peace be with you all !
Amen !

(4) *An Introduction for Phœbe.* XVI, 1-2

- XVI, 1. I commend to you our sister, Phœbe,
 who is a deaconess of the Church at Cenchreæ,
 2. that ye may receive her in the Lord
 in a manner worthy of the Saints,
 and that ye may stand by her
 in every circumstance in which she may need you.
 For she herself has stood by many—including myself.

(5) *Greetings to Friends in Rome.* XVI, 3-16

3. Greet Prisca and Aquila
 my fellow-workers in Christ Jesus,—
4. who for my life offered their own necks,
 to whom not I only,
 but all the Gentile Churches as well,
 give thanks !
5. And [greet] also the Church in their house.
 Greet my beloved Epænetus,—
 the first-fruits of Asia unto Christ !
6. Greet Mary, who has greatly toiled for you.
7. Greet Andronicus and Junias,
 my fellow-countrymen and fellow-prisoners,
 who are of high repute with the Apostles,
 who also were in Christ before me.
8. Greet Amplias, my beloved in the Lord.
9. Greet Urbanus, our fellow-worker in Christ,
 and Stachys, my beloved.
10. Greet Apelles, that well-tried one in Christ !
 Greet those who belong to the household of Aristobulus.
11. Greet Herodion, my fellow-countryman.
 Greet those of the household of Narcissus
 who are in the Lord.
12. Greet Tryphæna and Tryphosa,
 who toil in the Lord.
 Greet the beloved Persis,
 for she has toiled much in the Lord.
13. Greet Rufus, the chosen in the Lord,
 and [greet] too, his mother—who is mine also !
14. Greet Asyncritus, Phlegon,
 Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas,
 and the brethren [who are] with them.
15. Greet Philologus and Julia,
 Nereus and his sister, and Olympas,
 and all the Saints with them.
16. Greet one another with a holy kiss.
 All the churches of Christ greet you !

(6) *A word of warning against false teachers.* XVI, 17-20

17. I exhort you, Brethren,
to keep watch on those
who arouse dissensions,
and (set up) obstacles,
against the doctrine which ye have learned :
and keep ye out of their way.
18. for such men serve not Christ, Our Lord,
but their own belly,
and by flattering and fair speeches
they beguile the hearts of the guileless.
19. For your obedience [to the Gospel]
has reached unto all,
and so I rejoice over you.
It is my desire
that ye be wise unto good,
but pure in regard to evil.
20. The God of Peace will soon crush Satan
beneath your feet.
The grace of Our Lord Jesus be with you !

(7) *Greetings from Friends at Corinth.* XVI, 21-23

21. Timothy, my fellow-worker, greets you
so also [do] my fellow-countrymen,
Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater.
22. I, Tertius, who write this letter,
greet you in the Lord.
23. Gaius, my host, and the host of the whole Church
greet you.
Erastus, the city-treasurer, greets you,
and so does the brother, Quartus.

(8) *The Doxology.* XVI, 25-27

25. Now, to Him that has power to strengthen you
according to my Gospel,
and the preaching of Jesus Christ,
according to the revelation of a mystery
which was hidden in silence for eternal ages,
26. but now has been shown forth,
and, by prophetic writings,
according to the decree of the Eternal God,
has been published to all the Gentiles
for [their] submission to the Faith,
27. to the only wise God be glory
through Jesus Christ,
to Whom be glory for ever and ever !
Amen.

M. H. GILL AND SON, LTD., PRINTERS, DUBLIN

BS
3666
B83

1365550

Bible. N.T. Romans. Eng-
lish. 1934. Boylan.



AUG 5 - 1942

MAR 26, 1941

APR 10 1946

JUN

MAY 5 1947

JUN 10 1947

JUN 10 1947

JUN 10 1947

W. G. Cress

A. M. Wilder

J. H. G. G. G.

W. G. Cress

A. G. Maxwell

G. E. Pellett

Prof. Vöölus

W. G. Cress

W. G. Cress

George J. Cress

M. G. Cress

BS
3666
B83

1365550

EMIT HALL LIBRARY